"Three important things in
reign of George I + II.
1. King staying away from cabinet
meetings
2. First Prime Minister
3. Development of further colonizat

Atlantic Monthly 1921-22
Jan, Aug

1 India Interments
Lowell + Dodge
British Empire

Lutie Mae Hoffman
Stephens College
Room 306 South
and

Mayota Pepper
Room 415 South

10 ¢

Amer. Govt.
Egg + Ray
Introd. to Pol. Sci.

A SHORTER HISTORY OF ENGLAND AND GREATER BRITAIN

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
NEW YORK · BOSTON · CHICAGO · DALLAS
ATLANTA · SAN FRANCISCO

MACMILLAN & CO., LIMITED
LONDON · BOMBAY · CALCUTTA
MELBOURNE

THE MACMILLAN CO. OF CANADA, LTD.
TORONTO

Minnie Wells
204 Nutt
Mrs. McBride

MODERN
ENGLAND AND WALES
ENGLISH MILES
0
50
100
Berwick
HOLY I.
Cheviot Hills
NORTHUMBERLAND
Newcastle
Carlisle
Solway Firth
CUMBERLAND
Durham
DURHAM
Sunderland
N. Tyne
R. Wear
R. Tees
NORTH CHANNEL
St. Bees Head
Appleby
WESTMORELAND
Whitby
Scarborough
R. Swale
R. Ure
R. Nidd
Ripon
Flamborough Head
ISLE OF MAN
Lancaster
Morecambe B.
YORK
York
Preston
Leeds
Hull
IRISH SEA
R. Ribble
Bradford
R. Aire
Spurn Head
R. Humber
Formby Head
LANCASHIRE
Bolton
Liverpool
Worsley
Manchester
Sheffield
R. Don
R. Trent
Holyhead
HOLY I.
ANGLESEA
R. Dee
Bangor
Carnarvon Bay
CHESHIRE
Chester
DERBY
Lincoln
LINCOLN
Denbigh
DENBIGH
Nottingham
Newark
R. Witham
The Wash
Derby
STAFFORD
Stafford
BARDSEY I.
Shrewsbury
Dolgelly
SHROPSHIRE
Lichfield
LEICESTER
Leicester
Yarmouth
Norwich
NORFOLK
Lowestoft
MONTGOMERY
Montgomery
Birmingham
Coventry
R. Ouse
R. Waveney
RADNOR
Tenby
WORCESTER
WARWICK
Rugby
Huntingdon
Newmarket
SUFFOLK
Fishguard
CARDIGAN
HEREFORD
Worcester
Warwick
Northampton
Cambridge
Ipswich
Bedford
Hereford
R. Stour
Harwich
St. Davids Head
PEMBROKE
CARMARTHEN
Cheltenham
Gloucester
Woodstock
OXFORD
HERTFORD
ESSEX
Colchester
St. Brides Bay
Pembroke
Milford Haven
Monmouth
MONMOUTH
GLOUCESTER
Oxford
Rye House
Chelmsford
Carmarthen Bay
Worms Head
Chepstow
Thames
GLAMORGAN
Swansea
London
Greenwich
The Nore
R. Thames
North Foreland
Cardiff
Kingswood
Eton
MIDDLESEX
Sheerness
R. Severn
Bristol
Hungerford
BERKSHIRE
Houslow
Rochester
Chatham
Canterbury
BRISTOL CHANNEL
Bath
Hampton Court
SURREY
KENT
LUNDY I.
Philips Norton
WILTSHIRE
Barnstable Bay
Barnstaple
Wells
Salisbury
Guildford
Dover
South Foreland
SOMERSET
Bridgewater
HAMPSHIRE
Sedgemoor
Shaftesbury
Winchester
Taunton
Southampton
SUSSEX
Chichester
Brighton
Dungeness
Bude Bay
DEVON
Exeter
DORSET
Lyme
Wareham
New Forest
Portsmouth
I. OF WIGHT
Selsea Bill
Beachy Head
STRAITS OF DOVER
Trevose Head
Teignmouth
Dorchester
St. Albans Head
Plymouth
Torbay
Brixham
Start Pt.
Falmouth
Mizenhead
The Lizard
Land's End
ENGLISH CHANNEL
FRANCE
Cherbourg
Longitude West
Havre
Longitude East

A SHORTER HISTORY OF ENGLAND

AND

GREATER BRITAIN

BY

ARTHUR LYON CROSS, PH.D.

RICHARD HUDSON PROFESSOR OF ENGLISH HISTORY IN
THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
AUTHOR OF "A HISTORY OF ENGLAND AND GREATER BRITAIN"

New York

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

1923

All rights reserved

COPYRIGHT, 1920,
BY THE MACMILLAN COMPANY.

Set up and electrotyped. Published October, 1920.

Norwood Press
J. S. Cushing Co. — Berwick & Smith Co.
Norwood, Mass., U.S.A.

PREFACE

THE present work is a shortened form of the author's *History of England and Greater Britain*, brought up to the beginning of 1919. Four chapters have been added, two of which aim to re-survey the relations between the Mother Country and the Self-governing Dominions beyond the seas and British foreign relations from 1870 to 1914, and two of which seek to describe the activities of Britain and Greater Britain in the World War, as well as the problems of government and administration which the War involved.

In treating of the causes which drew the British into the War it has been necessary, for the sake of completeness, to repeat much that has of late been frequently well described and is now oppressively familiar. Unfortunately the Kautsky documents and the latest Austrian *Red Book* which would have caused the writer to modify his statements concerning the Kaiser's alleged conference and the respective responsibility of the German and Austro-Hungarian Governments in the negotiations following Serajevo, were not at hand when his chapter went to press. However, the first part of the story has been admirably told, in the light of the new evidence, by Professor S. B. Fay in the *American Historical Review* for July, 1920, and the second part is promised in October.

In revising and condensing the earlier parts of the book the writer has confined his abbreviating largely to the political narrative, retaining the surveys of social, industrial, intellectual and religious conditions with comparatively little curtailment. He wishes to repeat his thanks to those who have so kindly assisted him in his first undertaking, and further to express his obligations to his colleagues Professors Campbell Bonner, A. E. R. Boak and W. R. Frayer for very helpful suggestions.

ARTHUR LYON CROSS.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN,
August, 1920.

Read:- J.R. Green's His. of Eng.
97-112
Gardner 138-167
Chaney 140-168 (Sh.t. His of Eng.)

Important Documents

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	The British Isles: Their Physical Features and Resources	1
II.	The Earliest Inhabitants of Britain	8
III.	The Coming of the Anglo-Saxons. The "Heptarchy" and Struggle for Supremacy	18
IV.	The Ascendancy of the West Saxons. The Growth and Decline and Fall of the Anglo-Saxon Monarchy	29
V.	The State of Society at the Close of the Anglo-Saxon Period	42
VI.	The Anglo-Norman Kings (1066–1154). The Strengthening of the Central Power of William and His Sons. The Interval of Anarchy in the Reign of Stephen	53
VII.	Henry II (1154–1189). The Restoration of the Royal Power and the Rise of the English Common Law	71
VIII.	Richard I (1189–1199) and the Transition from Absolute toward Limited Monarchy. Conditions at the Close of the Twelfth Century	80
IX.	The Reign of John (1199–1216). The Loss of Normandy, the Quarrel with the Church, the Baronial Revolt, and Magna Carta	89
X.	Henry III. The Struggle of the Barons to Maintain the Charter, to Expel Foreign Influence, and to Control the Administration of Kingdom. Conditions at the Close of the Reign	98
XI.	Edward I and Edward II (1272–1327). The Completion of the Foundations of the English Constitutional System	111
XII.	The Reign of Edward III (1327–1377). The Beginning of the Hundred Years' War. Chivalry at Its Height. The Growing Importance of the Commons. The Increase of National Sentiment. First Attacks on the Power of Rome	125

CHAPTER		PAGE
XIII.	Life in England under the First Three Edwards (1272–1377)	137
XIV.	Richard II (1377–1399). The End of the Plantagenet Dynasty	153
XV.	The House of Lancaster in the Ascendant. Henry IV (1399–1413), Henry V (1413–1422), and "The Constitutional Experiment" in Government	161
XVI.	The Fall of the House of Lancaster. Henry VI (1422–1461)	168
XVII.	The Yorkist Kings and the End of the Wars of the Roses. Edward IV (1461–1483), Edward V (1483), Richard III (1483–1485)	175
XVIII.	The Beginning of the Tudor Absolutism. Henry VII (1485–1509)	183
XIX.	The First Years of Henry VIII (1509–1529). The Eve of the Separation from Rome	194
XX.	Henry VIII and the Separation from Rome (1529–1547)	206
XXI.	The Henrician Régime (1509–1547)	222
XXII.	The Protestant Extremists in Power. Edward VI (1547–1553)	230
XXIII.	The English Counter-Reformation. Mary (1553–1558)	236
XXIV.	The Elizabethan Religious Settlement and the Early Years of Elizabeth's Reign (1558–1572)	243
XXV.	Elizabeth's Ascendancy and Decline (1572–1603)	253
XXVI.	Elizabethan England (1558–1603)	264
XXVII.	James I and the Beginnings of the Puritan Revolution (1603–1625)	285
XXVIII.	Charles I and the Precipitation of the Conflict between King and People (1625–1640)	301
XXIX.	From the Opening of the Long Parliament to the Outbreak of the Civil War (1640–1642)	319
XXX.	From the Outbreak of the Civil War to the Execution of Charles I (1642–1649)	327

CHAPTER PAGE

XXXI. The Kingless Decade: The Commonwealth and the Protectorate (1649–1660) 348

XXXII. From the Restoration to the Fall of Clarendon (1660–1667) 359

XXXIII. From the Fall of Clarendon to the Death of Charles II (1667–1685) 372

XXXIV. James II and the "Glorious Revolution" (1685–1688) . 385

XXXV. Puritan and Cavalier England 400

XXXVI. The Early Years of the New Dynasty and the Opening of the Great War. William and Mary (1689–1694) 423

XXXVII. The Completion of the Revolution of 1688. William Alone (1694–1702) 434

XXXVIII. The End of the Stuart Dynasty. Anne (1702–1714) . 445

XXXIX. The First Hanoverian, George I (1714–1727) . . . 463

XL. The Ascendancy and Fall of Walpole and the Opening of a New Era of War. The First Part of the Reign of George II (1727–1748) 475

XLI. The Duel for Empire. The Closing Years of George II's Reign (1748–1760) 491

XLII. The Revival of the Royal Ascendancy. The First Years of George III (1760–1770) 506

XLIII. The American Revolution and the End of the Personal Ascendancy of George III (1770–1783) . . . 525

XLIV. Eighteenth-Century England to the Eve of the Industrial Revolution 543

XLV. The Younger Pitt: The New Toryism and Administrative Reform (1784–1793) 570

XLVI. The Great War with France to the Peace of Amiens (1793–1802) 587

XLVII. The Struggle against Napoleon: From Amiens to Waterloo (1802–1815) 600

CHAPTER PAGE

XLVIII. From the Overthrow of Napoleon to the Eve of the Great Reform Bill. The Last Years of George III and the Reign of George IV (1815–1830) . . . 615

XLIX. England at the Eve of the Reform Bill 633

L. The Epoch of Reform. William IV (1830–1837) . . 645

LI. The Early Years of Victoria's Reign and the Triumph of Free Trade (1837–1846) 661

LII. The Revolutionary Movements in Europe and the Beginning of a New Period of War (1846–1856). The Palmerstonian Régime and the End of an Epoch (1857–1865) 676

LIII. A New Era in Democracy. The Political Rivalry of Gladstone and Disraeli (1765–1880) 697

LIV. The Two Last Decades of Victoria's Reign (1880–1901) 712

LV. Victorian and Post-Victorian England 727

LVI. Sketch of the Reign of Edward VII (1901–1910) and of the Early Years of George V (1910–1914) . . . 752

LVII. A Century of the Development of Greater Britain . 761

LVIII. British Foreign Relations with Particular Reference to Germany and the Causes of the World War (1870–1914) 799

LIX. Britain and Greater Britain in the World War (1914–1918), Part I 832

LX. Britain and Greater Britain in the World War (1914–1918), Part II 865

MAPS

Modern England and Wales	*Frontispiece*
	FACING PAGE
Roman Britain	12
England to Illustrate the Germanic Settlements	22
Possessions of the House of Anjou	72
Scotland in the Reign of Edward I	112
England to Illustrate the Wars of the Roses	172
Ireland after 1603	324
England to Illustrate the Civil Wars	330
Scotland after 1603	334
Spain to Illustrate the Peninsular War	604
Africa in 1910	778
India in 1857	786
The British Empire in 1914	794
The War Area of Western Europe, 1914–1918	836–837
	INSETS
Gallipoli, 1915	842
The British Advance in Asiatic Turkey, 1918	899

GENEALOGICAL TABLES

RULERS OF ENGLAND AND GREATER BRITAIN

INTRODUCTION

TABLE		PAGE
I.	Rulers of Anglo-Saxon England, 802–1066	xv
II.	The Anglo-Norman Kings, 1066–1154	xv
III.	The Earlier Angevin Kings, 1154–1272	xvi
IV.	The Later Angevins or Plantagenets, 1272–1399	xvi
V.	The Houses of York and Lancaster	xvii
VI.	The House of Tudor	xvii
VII.	The Stuarts	xviii
VIII.	The House of Hanover	xviii

RELATED FAMILIES AND CLAIMANTS

IX.	The Beauforts and the Tudors	xix
X.	The Greys and the Seymours	xix
XI.	The Howards	xx
XII.	The Exiled Stuarts	xx
XIII.	The Kings of Scotland, 1066–1603	xxi
XIV.	Kings of France	xxii

List of Prime Ministers from Walpole to Lloyd George . . xxv

GENEALOGICAL TABLES

I

RULERS OF ANGLO-SAXON ENGLAND, 802–1066



II

THE ANGLO-NORMAN KINGS, 1066–1154



[1] Illegitimate.

III

THE EARLIER ANGEVIN KINGS, 1154–1272


Henry II = Eleanor of Guienne, d. 1204, divorced wife of Louis VII
1154–1189
Henry, d. 1183
Richard I, 1189–1199
Geoffrey = Constance of Brittany d. 1186
John = Isabella of Angoulême 1199–1216
Eleanor
Arthur, d. 1203
Henry III = Eleanor of Provence 1216–1272
Joan, m. Alexander II of Scotland
Eleanor, m. Simon de Montfort
Richard, King of the Romans, d. 1271
Edward I, 1272–1307
Edmund Crouchback, d. 1295
Margaret, m. Alexander III of Scotland

IV

THE LATER ANGEVINS, OR THE PLANTAGENETS, 1272–1399


Henry III, 1216–1272
Edward I = (1) Eleanor of Castile; (2) Margaret of France
1272–1307
Margaret, m. Alexander III of Scotland
Edmund (Crouchback) Earl of Lancaster
(1) Edward II = Isabella of France
1307–1327
(2) Edmund, Earl of Kent, executed 1330
Thomas, Earl of Lancaster, d. 1322
Henry, Earl of Lancaster, d. 1345
Edward III = Philippa of Hainault
1327–1377
Joan, m. (1) Sir T. Holland; (2) The Black Prince
Henry, Duke of Lancaster, d. 1362
Blanche = John of Gaunt
Edward = Joan of Kent
Black Prince, d. 1376
Lionel, Duke of Clarence
John of Gaunt, d. 1399 = Blanche, heiress of Lancaster
Edmund, Duke of York
Thomas, Duke of Gloucester d. 1397
Richard II, 1377–1399
Philippa = Edmund Mortimer, d. 1380
Henry IV, 1399–1413
Roger, Earl of March, declared heir of Richard II, in 1385; killed in Ireland, 1398

[1] Second surviving son.

V

THE HOUSES OF YORK AND LANCASTER


Edward III, 1327–1377
Lionel, Duke of Clarence (2d son), d. 1368
Edmund, Duke of York (4th son), d. 1401
John of Gaunt (3d son), d. 1399
Blanche of Lancaster
Henry IV, 1399–1413
Philippa d. 1381
Edmund Mortimer, Earl of March (great-grandson of Roger Mortimer, who was executed 1330)
Henry V, 1413–1422
Thomas, Duke of Clarence, killed 1421
John, Duke of Bedford, d. 1435
Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, d. 1446
Henry VI, 1422–1461
Elizabeth, m. Henry Hotspur
Roger, Earl of March, killed 1398
Edmund, Earl of March, d. 1424
Anne
Richard, Earl of Cambridge, executed 1415
Edward, Duke of York (elder son), killed at Agincourt, 1415
Richard, Duke of York, killed at Wakefield, 1460
Edward IV, 1461–1483
George, Duke of Clarence, executed 1478
Richard III, 1483–1485
Edward V,[1] 1483
Richard, Duke of York [1]
Elizabeth
Henry VII

VI

THE HOUSE OF TUDOR


Henry VII, 1485–1509 great-great-grandson of John of Gaunt, by his mother, Margaret Beaufort
Elizabeth of York, daughter of Edward IV
Arthur, d. 1502
Henry VIII, 1509–1547
Margaret, m. James IV of Scotland
Mary
(1) Louis XII of France, d. 1515
(2) Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk
Mary, 1553–1558
Elizabeth, 1558–1603
Edward VI, 1547–1553

[1] Believed to have been murdered in the Tower, 1483.

VII

THE STUARTS


James I[1] = Anne of Denmark, 1603–1625 d. 1619
Henry, d. 1612
Charles I, 1625–1649
Elizabeth = Frederick of the Palatinate d. 1662
Charles II, 1660–1685
James II, 1685–1688, d. 1701
Mary = William of Orange, d. 1650 d. 1660
James (the old Pretender), b. 1688, d. 1765
Anne, 1702–1714
Mary = William III, 1688–1694 1688–1702
Prince Rupert, d. 1682
Prince Maurice, d. 1652
Sophia = Elector of Hanover d. 1714
George I, 1714–1727
George II

VIII

THE HOUSE OF HANOVER


George I, 1714–1727
George II, 1727–1760
Sophia = Frederick William I, King of Prussia, 1713–1740
Frederick Prince of Wales, d. 1751 = Augusta of Saxe-Gotha
William, Duke of Cumberland, d. 1765
Frederick the Great, 1740–1786
George III = Sophia Charlotte of 1760–1820 Mecklenburg-Strelitz
George IV, 1820–1830
William IV, 1830–1837
Frederick, Duke of York, d. 1827
Edward, Duke of Kent, d. 1820
Princess Charlotte, d. 1817
Victoria = Albert of Saxe-Coburg, 1837–1901 d. 1861
Victoria = Frederick, d. 1901 German Emperor, March–June, 1888
Albert Edward, Edward VII, 1901–1910
Alfred, Duke of Edinburgh, d. 1900
Arthur, Duke of Connaught
Leopold, Duke of Albany, d. 1884
William II, German Emperor, 1888
George V = Princess Mary of 1910 Teck
Edward Albert Christian George Andrew Patrick David

[1] See Table XIII.

RELATED FAMILIES AND CLAIMANTS

IX

THE BEAUFORTS AND THE TUDORS


John of Gaunt[1] = Katharine Swynford
John, Earl of Somerset, d. 1410
Henry, Cardinal Beaufort, d. 1447
Katherine of France = Owen Tudor
John, Duke of Somerset, d. 1444
Edmund Tudor Earl of Richmond
=
Margaret
Henry VII, 1485–1509

X

THE GREYS AND THE SEYMOURS


Henry VII, 1485–1509
Henry VIII, 1509–1547
Margaret = James IV of Scotland
Mary m. (1) Louis XII of France
= (2) Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk
Frances =
Henry Grey, Marquis of Dorset and Duke of Suffolk
Jane Grey = Guilford Dudley
Catherine Grey = Edward Seymour, Earl of Hertford
Edward Seymour, Lord Beauchamp, d. 1612
Edward, d. 1618
William, afterward 2d Duke of Somerset (1588–1660), m. Arabella Stuart

[1] For first wife, see Table V

XI

THE HOWARDS

John Howard, created Duke of Norfolk, killed at Bosworth, 1485

Thomas, Earl of Surrey, victor at Flodden, 1513, Duke of Norfolk, 1514, d. 1524

- Thomas, Duke of Norfolk, d. 1554
  - Henry, Earl of Surrey, beheaded, 1547
    - Thomas, Duke of Norfolk, beheaded, 1572
- Edmund
  - Katherine. m. Henry VIII, executed, 1542
- William, created Lord Howard of Effingham
  - Charles, commander against the Armada, 1588, created Earl of Nottingham, 1590, d. 1624
- Elizabeth = Thomas Boleyn
  - Anne Boleyn, m. Henry VIII, executed, 1536
    - Queen Elizabeth, 1558–1603

XII

THE EXILED STUARTS

CHARLES I

- CHARLES II —
- JAMES II
  - James Francis Edward, James III the Old Pretender, d. 1765,
    - Charles Edward, Charles III, The Young Pretender, d. 1788
    - Henry, Cardinal of York, d. 1807
- Henrietta = Philip of Orleans, brother of Louis XIV
  - Anne = Victor Amadeus, Duke of Savoy, 1st King of Sardinia
    - Charles Emmanuel III, King of Sardinia, d. 1773
      - Victor Amadeus III, d. 1796
        - Victor Emmanuel III, d. 1824
          - Mary = Francis IV, Duke of Modena, d. 1840
            - Ferdinand = Archduchess Elizabeth of Austria
              - Mary Theresa[1] = Ludwig, King of Bavaria, 1913
                - Rupert
                - Luitpold

[1] Mary IV, the present head of the House of Stuart.

XIII

THE KINGS OF SCOTLAND, 1066–1603


Duncan I
Malcolm III = Margaret, 1058–1093 d. 1093
Donald Bane, 1094–1097
Duncan I, 1093
Edgar, 1097–1107
Alexander I. 1107–1124
Matilda, d. 1118, m. Henry I, d. 1135
David I, 1124–1153
Henry, Earl of Huntingdon, d. 1152
Malcolm, 1153–1165
William the Lion, 1165–1214
David, Earl of Huntingdon
Alexander II, 1214–1249
Alexander III, 1249–1286
Margaret
Isabella
Devorguilla = John Balliol
Robert Bruce,[1] d. 1295
Margaret = Eric, King of Norway
Margaret
John Balliol,[1] 1292–1296
Robert, d. 1305
Margaret, Maid of Norway, 1286–1290
John Comyn, murdered
Edward Balliol
Robert I, 1306–1329
David Bruce, m. Joan, sister of Edward II, 1329–1370
Margaret = Walter the Steward or Stuart, ancestor of the Stuart line
Robert II, 1370–1390
Robert III, 1390–1406
Robert, Duke of Albany, d. 1420
James I = Jane Beaufort 1406–1437
James II, 1437–1460
James III, 1460–1488
(1) James IV = Margaret Tudor = Earl of Angus 1488–1513
James V, 1513–1542
Margaret = Earl of Lenox
Mary, Queen of Scots = Lord Darnley, murdered 1567
1542–1567
Charles, Earl of Lenox
James VI of Scotland and I of England, 1567–1625
Arabella Stuart

[1] Claimants in 1292.

XIV

KINGS OF FRANCE


Hugh Capet, 987–996
Robert I, 996–1031
Henry I, 1031–1060
Philip I, 1060–1108
Louis VI, 1108–1137
Louis VII, 1137–1180
Philip II (Augustus), 1180–1223
Louis VIII, 1223–1226 (invader of England, 1216)
(Saint) Louis IX, 1226–1270
Philip III, 1270–1285
Philip IV (the Fair), 1285–1314
Charles of Valois
Louis X. 1314–1316
Philip V, 1316–1322
Charles IV, 1322–1328
Isabella, m. Edward II
Edward III
Philip VI, 1328–1350
John II, 1350–1364
John I, d. 1316
Joan, Queen of Navarre
Charles the Bad
Charles V, 1364–1380
Philip, Duke of Burgundy, d. 1404
Charles VI, 1380–1422
Louis of Orleans, murdered, 1407
John, Duke of Burgundy, murdered, 1419, at Montereau
Charles VII, 1422–1461
Charles, Duke of Orleans, captured at Agincourt, grandfather of Louis XII, 1498–1515
Philip, Duke of Burgundy, d. 1467
Louis XI, 1461–1483
Charles (the Bold), Duke of Burgundy, d. 1477, m. Margaret, sister of Edward IV
Charles VIII, 1483–1498
Claude = Francis I, 1515–1547, a great-grandson of Louis of Orleans
Henry II = Catharine de' Médicis 1547–1549
Francis II, 1559–1560, m. Mary Queen of Scots
Charles IX, 1560–1574
Henry III, 1574–1589 suitor of Queen Elizabeth
Francis, Duke of Alençon, suitor of Queen Elizabeth
Margaret =
Henry IV (Henry of Navarre), 1589–1610, a descendant of Robert, son of St. Louis, (1226–1270)
= Marie de Médicis


Louis XIII,
1610–1643
Louis XIV,
1643–1715
Louis (dauphin),
d. 1711
Louis,
Duke of Burgundy,
d. 1712
Louis XV,
1715–1774
Louis (dauphin),
d. 1765
Louis XVI,
1774–1793
Louis XVII,
never reigned,
d. 1795
Louis XVIII,
1815–1824
Philip, King of Spain,
d. 1746
Ferdinand
of Spain
Charles,
King of Naples
Charles X,
1824–1830,
abdicated.
Grandfather
of the Count
de Chambord,
who died
without issue,
1884
Philip,
Duke of Orleans,
d. 1710
Philip (Regent),
d. 1723.
Great-great-grand-
father of
Louis Philippe,
1830–1848
Duke of
Orleans,
d. 1842
Count de
Paris,
d. 1894
Philip,
Duke of Orleans
Duke
d'Aumale

LIST OF PRIME MINISTERS FROM WALPOLE TO LLOYD GEORGE

1721–1742	Sir Robert Walpole.
1742–1743	Lord Wilmington.
1743–1754	Henry Pelham.
1754–1756	I. Duke of Newcastle.
1756–1757	Duke of Devonshire.
	Real head, William Pitt Secretary of State.
1757–1762	II. Duke of Newcastle.
	Pitt Secretary of State till 1761.
1762–1763	Earl of Bute.
1763–1765	George Grenville.
1765–1766	I. Marquis of Rockingham.
1766–1770	Duke of Grafton.
1770–1782	Lord North.
March–July, 1782	II. Marquis of Rockingham.
1782–1783	Earl of Shelburne.
April–December, 1783	Coalition Ministry.
	Duke of Portland nominal Prime Minister.
	Real heads Fox and North.
1783–1801	I. William Pitt, the younger.
1801–1804	Henry Addington (Viscount Sidmouth).
1804–1806	II. William Pitt.
1806–1807	"All the Talents."
	Lord Grenville and Fox, d. September, 1806.
1807–1809	II. Duke of Portland.
1809–1812	Spencer Perceval.
1812–1827	Lord Liverpool.
April–August, 1827	George Canning.
1827–1828	Lord Goderich.
1828–1830	Duke of Wellington.
1830–1834	Lord Grey.
July–November, 1834	I. Lord Melbourne.
1834–1835	I. Sir Robert Peel.
1835–1841	II. Lord Melbourne.
1841–1846	II. Sir Robert Peel.
1846–1852	I. Lord John Russell.
February–December, 1852	I. Lord Derby.
1852–1855	Lord Aberdeen.
1855–1858	I. Lord Palmerston.
1858–1859	II. Lord Derby.
1859–1865	II. Lord Palmerston.
1865–1866	II. Lord John Russell.
1866–1868	III. Lord Derby.
February–December, 1868	I. Benjamin Disraeli (Earl of Beaconsfield).
1868–1874	I. William E. Gladstone.
1874–1880	II. Disraeli.

1880–1885	II. Gladstone.
1885–1886	I. Marquis of Salisbury.
February–July, 1886	III. Gladstone.
1886–1892	II. Salisbury.
1892–1894	IV. Gladstone.
1894–1895	Lord Rosebery (Earl of Midlothian).
1895–1902	III. Salisbury.
1902–1905	Mr. Arthur Balfour.
1905–1908	Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman.
1908–1916	Mr. Herbert Henry Asquith.
1916–	Mr. David Lloyd George.

A SHORTER HISTORY OF ENGLAND AND GREATER BRITAIN

A SHORTER HISTORY OF ENGLAND AND GREATER BRITAIN

CHAPTER I

THE BRITISH ISLES: THEIR PHYSICAL FEATURES AND RESOURCES

England and the British Empire. — England is the cradle and present center of the British Empire, an empire which covers a quarter of the land surface of the earth and includes a population of more than four hundred million souls.[1] This little country of England, with an area of about 50,000 square miles, barely larger than the state of New York, forms, together with Scotland and Wales, the island known as Great Britain. Ireland, lying to the west, is the only other important division of the United Kingdom, although the British Isles which compose it number no less than five thousand, with a total area of 120,000 square miles and a population of about 45,000,000. It will be the purpose of this history to trace the course of events by which England and the adjacent countries became the United Kingdom, and by which the United Kingdom has become the greatest sea power ever known, and has fashioned an empire with an extent of territory nearly a hundred and a population fully ten times its own.

Climate and Distribution of Rainfall. — In this remarkable development climate has been especially important. Extreme cold is a serious obstacle to the production of those things on which man is dependent for his existence; extreme heat, on the other hand, checks active exertion by which character is developed and by which man is able to make the most of his surroundings. With respect to climate Great Britain has been especially fortunate. The summers are long enough to ripen the crops, while the winters are not too long or too severe seriously to interfere with outdoor occupations, agricultural pursuits can be carried on in many parts of the country

[1] At the last census before the Great War.

throughout the year, and there is rarely snow or ice enough to interrupt communications.

The moisture-laden winds from the southwest, which temper the climate, bring an abundance of rain which makes Ireland, Wales, and Scotland, and western England little suited for agriculture, though, in the case of England, the mountains, grouped and ranged along the western coast, modify and distribute the rainfall so that the greater part of the soil is well adapted for farming.[1]

Northern and Western England. — England proper is separated from Scotland by the indentation of the sea known as the Solway Firth, by the Cheviot Hills, and the Tweed River. There are two distinct divisions within the country itself, which might be marked by a line from the mouth of the Humber to the mouth of the Severn and thence down to the shores of the English Channel. North and west the country consists of mountains and moorlands. For centuries, this western country, given over mostly to sheep pasture, lay remote and backward, compared to the more favored districts south and east. Yet, even in early times, the mountains were serving their country well: the Pennines, running south from the Scotch border to the heart of the Midland country, formed a protecting wedge which served to split the waves of barbarian invasion and to prevent them from inundating the English plain. Furthermore, aside from regulating the distribution of moisture, the western mountains have determined the course and the nature of the important rivers — by giving them long, gentle slopes they have admirably adapted them for commerce and irrigation, in striking contrast to the short, precipitous torrents of Greece or of Wales and northern Scotland. Nor does the Pennine system isolate one part of the country from the other, for three canals run through it east and west. With the discovery of the use of steam in manufacturing, the Pennine range was found to contain vast stores of mineral wealth; in consequence the neighboring region has become the center of industrial England, and the once solitary mountain sides and vast stretches of moorland are now studded with smoking, busy cities and swarm with life. Little places, once mere villages, grew to be teeming centers of population. Manchester, for instance, which now has over a million inhabitants, and is the chief seat of the cotton manufacture, numbered, as late as 1776, only 27,000. Leeds is the headquarters for the production of wool, and Birmingham and Sheffield

[1] Even the extremely wet regions of the western midlands are not without their advantages, since a dryer climate which makes the threads brittle would be a great obstacle to cotton manufacture.

for iron and steel, while along the banks of the Clyde, the Tyne, the Wear, and the Tees are shipyards which supply not only Great Britain, but many other parts of the world. The Cumbrian group of mountains, unlike the Pennine range, is of little industrial importance. The native population is scanty, and sheep raising is the chief occupation, though, owing to the beauty of the scenery, the district is a center for tourists as well as for summer homes, and the lakes furnish a water supply for many of the cities farther south. The mountains of Cornwall, on the other hand, contain rich deposits of lead and tin, especially the latter, which have been worked for centuries.

Southeastern England. — The structure of southeast England is markedly different from that of the north and the west. It is prevailingly a plain varied with hills or uplands of limestone and chalk. In earlier times this southeastern country was the most prosperous and progressive section of England — it was the district earliest settled, and its soil was the most fruitful in the land, enabling people to live closer together than in the more barren north. Thus they were better able to exchange ideas and had more means and leisure for education; more important still, they were in closest communication with the Continent whither the medieval Englishman looked for trade, knowledge, fashions, and ideas. The Industrial Revolution of the late eighteenth century changed all this and, with the exception of London, the center of progress and ideas has shifted to the Midland country.

Internal Communication. — Before the Romans introduced their excellent road system, a system to which many of the European highways of the present day owe their origin, Britain was largely a land of tangled forests and impassable marshes, with the ridgeways and the rivers forming almost the sole means of communication. But, even with the advent of roads and railways, the rivers are still of great importance; they furnish irrigation for the soil, they are utilized to provide power for mills and factories, and, together with the canals which they supply, they continue to serve as a cheap and convenient means of transportation.

English River Systems. — There are three great systems: the Eastern, flowing mainly into the North Sea; the Southern, emptying into the English Channel; and the Western, which finds its chief outlet in the Bristol Channel and the Irish Sea. Taken as a whole the eastern system is the most important. Proceeding from north to south the first is the Tweed, famous for the cloth manufacture along its banks; the Tyne has for its chief port Newcastle, a great center

for the distribution of mining products; while the Humber is fed by the Ouse and the Trent, which with their tributaries bring the products of a large and wealthy district to Hull, the leading port of north-eastern England. The Thames is the largest river of England and the chief waterway across the south country; the harbor at its mouth is the finest in the whole kingdom; hence, in spite of the fact that the center of industry has shifted to the North, London is still the leader in imports and second only to Liverpool in exports. The rivers of the southern group are relatively short and unimportant. On the west two rivers call for special notice. The Severn, rising in the Welsh mountains, sweeps round to the east and south in the form of a bow widening at the end of its course into the Bristol Channel. Bristol, its chief port, rose to consequence as a result of the discovery of America. Yet, save for a small amount of wool manufacturing, the districts lying behind are mainly agricultural; therefore, Bristol had long ago to yield its preëminence as a port to Liverpool on the Mersey, situated in the center of a district rich in manufacturing, mining products, and pasture lands.

Importance of British Insularity. — There was a time when the British Isles formed a part of the neighboring continent of Europe. The watery barrier, which has existed since England began to have a history, has been a significant element in shaping her destiny. It has kept her out of reach of her greedy and powerful neighbors, thus enabling her to maintain her independence, to preserve her energies free for commercial and colonial expansion, and to develop her ways of thinking, manners, customs, and system of government in her own way. In early times when the population was scanty and means of resistance unorganized, peoples from the Continent forced their way in; but never since the eleventh century has there been any serious danger from this source. At the same time, the country has not been too remote to feel the influence of the great Continental movements such as the Crusades, the Revival of Learning, the Reformation, and the French Revolution, though most of them had spent their force when they reached her shores, and hence took a very individual form.

World Position and World Trade. — A glance at a map of the globe will show how centrally the British are situated with respect to the two great continents of Europe and America and will help to explain British leadership in commerce. Indeed, one fifth of their present exports consists of things produced by other countries and distributed by British ships; wool from Australia is carried to Germany, France, and the United States and, in the same way, French silks are con-

veyed to Australia. Likewise, the raw cotton from America, India, and Egypt passes through British ports on its way to the Continent of Europe, while most of the Oriental goods destined for the United States are handled in the same manner. With the further advantage of excellent harbors and a most accessible coast, her seaports naturally grew to be important commercial centers — Newcastle, Hull, and London on the east, — Bristol, Liverpool, and, more recently, Glasgow on the west.

England as a Producing Power. — But England is not only a distributing power, she is a producing, a manufacturing power as well. Here, too, physical conditions have been most favorable. Her soil is well adapted for sheep raising, and sheep furnished not only food, but the material for clothes; then with the introduction of machinery her vast stores of iron and coal were extensively developed for manufacturing. The great productiveness of the country led to an overflow of population, this led to colonization, and the colonies in their turn created new markets.

Wales. — The rocky coast, the rugged mountainous surface, and the excessive moisture of the climate make Wales of little value for agriculture, while the barriers to communication and the prevailing wildness produced a people fierce, independent, and disunited, who fought not only against England, but among themselves. At the same time, the beauty of the scenery tended to foster a romantic imagination and a school of bards who sang with rare beauty and exaltation of sentiment. The country was transformed by the Industrial Revolution of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and now derives its chief wealth from its mineral products, coal, iron, copper, lead, zinc, slate, limestone. Cardiff is a busy town noted for its export of coal and iron and for its docks. The coal of the Black Mountains is famous for its smelting and Swansea is, perhaps, the chief center in the world for this industry, while the Cambrian range[1] is rich in slate quarries. But the industrial area is limited and the stretches of mountain districts, though they charm the tourist, reduce the average of population and wealth. Scarcely more than half the country is under cultivation and its total population is less than 2,000,000, not greatly exceeding that of Manchester and its adjoining towns.

Scotland. — Taken as a whole, Scotland is still less adapted for agriculture than Wales, only a fourth of its soil being devoted to that purpose. In the olden time, when men depended largely upon that form of livelihood, the country was indeed badly off. The northern

[1] Not to be confused with the Cumbrian.

Highlands, bounded by a rugged coast and stormy seas, a country of rugged mountains and remote inaccessible glens, sheltered a race fiery and turbulent who eked out a scanty support from hunting, fishing, and sheep raising, by cattle forays in which they plundered their neighbors, Scot and Englishman alike. At the present time this district lives largely off the hordes of tourists and sportsmen attracted by the wild beauty of the scenery and its preserves of fish and game. The country to the south, known as the Lowlands, is inhabited by people of quite another type — thrifty, industrious, and austere, touched, nevertheless, by strains of wild enthusiasm and poetic impulse. The southern Lowlands, or " Border," consists mainly of hill and moorland adapted for little but sheep raising, though it is as rich in historical association and romantic legend as it is poor in resources. In course of time, manufactures developed along the Tweed; but Scotland's greatest industrial gifts are centered farther north in the Lowland plain between the Border and the Highlands. The Firth of Forth on the east, and the Firth of Clyde on the west, furnish excellent harbors; a line of communication has been carried straight across the country by a canal joining the two bodies of water, and the neighboring districts are rich in mineral deposits. This combination of industrial resources and commercial facilities has led to a great development in manufacturing. The Clyde is the center of the world's shipbuilding and Glasgow, on its banks, is the second city in the United Kingdom.

Ireland. — England's early treatment of Ireland has done much to make her people miserable and unquiet; but much has been due to natural disadvantages. Her hills and mountains, though they encircle the coast, are too low to modify perceptibly the abundant rains brought by the ocean winds, and contribute rather to drain water into the central plain. With an average of over two hundred rainy days in the year much of the soil is too wet for agriculture and there are places which are mere bog and marsh. Ireland's mineral resources also are scanty; the coal is of poor quality, and, mainly in the southern county of Kilkenny, is separated from the chief deposits of iron which are in Antrim in the extreme northeast. Commercially, too, the country has been unfortunate; England lies in a position to intercept its Continental trade, many of its best harbors are to the west and north, where, at least in early times, they did little good, and there is only one navigable river. Dublin, the capital, and Belfast, noted for its linen manufactures and its shipbuilding, are the only towns of any considerable size. Conditions, however, are favorable to pastoral pursuits, and, relative to its population, Ireland raises more live stock than any

other country of Europe. Ireland's cattle trade, however, has been seriously affected by improved methods of transportation which has made American and Australian competition possible; but, since the end of the last century, a growing industry has been developed in supplying England with poultry and dairy produce. What with the new activities, coöperative banks, and coöperative farming the country has been more prosperous in the last decade than ever before, though the political situation is still very troubled.

General Summary. — While Ireland has been to some degree an unfortunate exception, Great Britain, in general, has been greatly favored by nature in attaining the preëminent position she now occupies. She enjoys the advantage of a mild and even climate, of a central geographical position, a coast line safe and accessible, of mountains stored with minerals and situated so as to regulate the rainfall and to form rivers adapted to internal communications.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING[1]

J. R. Green, *A Short Geography of the British Isles* (1903); the best description for historical purposes, but the tables of population are out of date. G. G. Chisholm, *Handbook of Commercial Geography* (8th ed. 1915). A. C. Ramsay, *Physical Geology and Geography of Great Britain* (1894). H. C. Mackinder, *Britain and the British Seas* (1892); the most recent work on the physical characteristics of the British Isles. A. Geikie, *Landscape in History* (1905). H. B. George, *The Relations of Geography and History* (1901).

[1] The editions are those accessible to the writer, preferably the most recent.

CHAPTER II

THE EARLIEST INHABITANTS OF BRITAIN

Means of Studying Primitive Peoples. — Far away in the dim past Britain was inhabited by men now extinct; since no written records tell what they did and how they lived, their times are known as the pre-historic. It is beyond our power to reconstruct any account of this period; but certain sciences throw some light on the physical characteristics of these ancient men, their conditions and customs, and the successive stages of their development. Archæology teaches much from a study and classification of the relics of tools, weapons, and places of habitation; from human remains, anthropology attempts to determine what manner of men they were and their race relationships; the strata in which such remains have been found enables geology to suggest information as to the relative age in which they lived; while, from such vestiges of their language as have survived, philology helps to determine their degree of culture and the other groups of people with whom they may have associated.

Paleolithic Men of the River Drift. — Ages ago, when Britain was still a part of the Continent, the earliest men appeared. Few, if any, remains of them in this period have been discovered, and none in Britain; but rude, unground weapons of chipped flint, unprovided with handles, found in the deposits of ancient rivers prove that they ranged over a wide territory from India on the east, northern Africa on the south, to Britain on the west. From the form and size of their implements and the places where they have been discovered, scholars conclude that they were a small race of nomad hunters, too rude to polish their weapons or to build themselves habitations, dwelling chiefly along the banks of rivers. They belonged to the most primitive type, the earliest stage of civilization, the old stone or paleolithic age.

Paleolithic Men of the Caves. — In course of time they gave way to a new race, still in the old stone age; for their weapons, though they had handles, were still of unpolished stone. While they had no do-

mestic animals and knew nothing of agriculture, they represented a distinctly higher type than their predecessors. Their arrowheads were of flint; but they formed harpoon heads of antlers, they made needles of bone and fashioned themselves clothes of skins sewed with reindeer sinews. They constructed bird snares, and speared fish with their barbed harpoons; they knew how to strike fire from flint, and boiled water by means of hot stones; moreover, they possessed a rare artistic faculty, carving pictures of animals and hunting scenes with great accuracy and spirit.

The Neolithic Men. — After another long interval the men of the old stone age gave place to the men of the new. Their weapons, still of stone, were more skillfully fashioned and were ground and polished to give them a smoother surface and a keener cutting edge. The new race, understanding the rudiments of navigation, crossed the watery barrier in canoes, some at least forty feet in length, bringing with them domestic animals, horses, short-horned cattle, sheep, dogs, goats, and pigs. They did not dwell in caves, but constructed dwellings by hollowing out circular pits under ground with an opening at the surface to admit light and air. They buried their dead in long elliptical barrows or mounds, numbers of which still exist, that they constructed by planting stones upright in the ground, by laying others across their tops, and covering the chamber thus formed with earth. The builders indicated their belief in a future life by burying tools and weapons with the departed, that they might have them for use in the other world. Their remains show these neolithic people to have been of small stature with so-called dolichocephalic skulls — long in proportion to their breadth.[1]

The "Celtic" Invaders. — The men of the new stone age were, in course of time, overcome by a fair-haired people who were much larger and stronger of body and were round headed or brachycephalic. The race of these invaders and the place of their origin has never been determined with any certainty.[2] Starting, it would seem, from the eastern part of the plain of Central Europe the new peoples, whom it has been customary to group together as Celts, poured westward in successive waves, the first of which must have reached Britain fully

[1] Folk of this physical type more diluted, fragments of their speech, and some of their superstitions still survive in western England, and in Wales, parts of Scotland, and Ireland.

[2] It was formerly the practice to call them the Celts and to assert that they formed a branch of a great family composed of the Greeks, Romans, Teutons, and Slavs in Europe and the Medes, Persians, and Hindus in Asia — a family to which the name Aryan or Indo-European was applied, but the view that there was such a family of peoples united by blood is no longer held.

a thousand years before the Christian era. Under the common name Celts are included no less than three groups of peoples who followed one another from the Continent. The first comers were the Goidels or Gaels, who were later pushed north and west, where their descendants still survive in Ireland, the Isle of Man, and the west highlands of Scotland. The Brythons, for whom they made way, are the ancestors of the modern Welshmen and of a portion of the inhabitants of the west coast of England. The rear guard of the Celtic bands was formed by a group of tribes known as the Belgae, who occupied the eastern and southern parts of the country till the Germans finally absorbed or destroyed some of them and drove the remainder to join their kinsmen in the west.

Sources of Information. — The Celts understood how to mix copper and tin to produce bronze — so superior to stone that its users have been placed a stage higher in the social scale than the stone men, and before they were conquered by later comers they had reached a third stage in civilization by learning to employ iron in their industries. We are able to form some opinion about them and their manner of life from the abundant remains they have left, skeletons, burial places, habitations, tools, weapons, and ornaments; moreover, since they survived into the time of written records, we learn further about them from inscriptions and accounts of old Greek and Roman writers.[1]

Religion. Druidism. — They worshiped the forces of nature as gods; they created lesser divinities for particular localities, identifying each grove, stream, or spring with its appropriate guardian spirit, and peopled the land with fairies, dwarfs, and elves. Living in wild and unfriendly surroundings, in the midst of dense gloomy forests and treacherous, inaccessible fens, exposed to storm, thunder and lightning, their attitude was naturally one of wonder mingled with fear. Much of their worship, which included human sacrifices, was designed to placate the ferocious or malicious powers to which they were exposed. They believed in wishing wells and cursing stones, and the mistletoe, which still figures in our Christmas celebrations, they venerated for its miraculous properties. Very probably they borrowed from the stone men their priestly system and ceremonialism known as Druidism. The Druids were a highly privileged body who ranked with the

[1] The first certain historical notice of the island of Britain comes from Pytheas, a Greek mathematician and explorer sent out by the merchants of Marseilles about 330 B.C. in the interests of trade development, and the fullest account is furnished by Cæsar in his *Gallic Wars*, though these early writings are fragmentary at best and have to be pieced out by what we know of the Gauls.

nobles and were exempt from all public burdens, who conducted the sacrifices, practiced magic, foretold the future, acted as judges, and were the custodians of learning, human and divine.

Dwellings and Stone Circles. — The Celts lived in huts of wood, roughly or altogether unhewn, or of reeds woven together and plastered with mud or clay. These were often placed in marshes or lakes on piles or artificial platforms for purposes of defense. They burned their dead and deposited their remains in round instead of long barrows. But the most striking monuments that they have left are the great stone circles which they may have used as sepulchers, or possibly, as was formerly believed, for temples. Stonehenge at Old Sarum — near the present Salisbury — the most celebrated, now consists of a confused mass of huge bowlders, but in its original form it must have been a wonderful evidence of the skill and devotion of the builders.

Characteristics. Social and Political Organization. — These old Celts were a rude, hardy folk, but hospitable and kind in their crude, boisterous way. Their serious occupation was war and their diversion rough games and immoderate eating and drinking. In the earliest times we find them tattooing or painting their bodies, a practice which long survived among the northern peoples, the Scots and the Caledonians or Picts.[1] At first their only form of social and political organization was the family, who chose their ablest male to lead them in war and to represent them in peace. As time went on, these families were united into tribes from which the most capable male member was selected as king. Their legal system was very primitive. They had no courts, as we understand the term, and their judges were merely umpires or arbitrators, who had no power to compel the acceptance of their decrees.

Trade and Industry. — In their earliest intercourse the Celts used cattle and bars of iron and tin for standards of value; but as early as 200 B.C. they seem, in the southeast, to have had gold coins fashioned on Greek models. In the absence of roads they made use of rivers and the tops of ridges as trade routes. The Thames and the Severn were especially important. Their greatest trade was in tin which they carried from Cornwall overland to the southeast coast, thence in ships to the shores of Gaul. Besides tin they came to export cattle, hides, grain, and also slaves and huge dogs, the latter used by the Gauls in war and by the Romans for hunting. Their imports were chiefly manufactured articles of iron and bronze, cloth, and salt. But this does not mean that they did not manufacture, to some extent them-

[1] Probably from the Latin *pictus*, painted.

selves. They were fond of bright colors, and we are told that they wore clothes of various hues, getting the dyestuff from the bark of trees. They excelled in enamel work and made many of the gold ornaments which they wore, as well as the weapons and chariots which they used in war.

Cæsar in Britain 55 and 54 B.C. — During the course of his famous conquest of the Gauls, Julius Cæsar determined to invade Britain. Late in August, 55 B.C., he set sail; but, owing to the lateness of the season and the fear of the autumn gales, returned to Gaul, after a brief survey of the neighboring country and some skirmishes with the tribes round about, who made a vain effort to resist his landing. The ensuing winter was devoted to building ships and collecting men and supplies for another campaign. By July he was ready. This time he marched inland and forced a passage of the Thames by a ford above London which the British had sought to obstruct by driving sharpened stakes under the water and along the opposite bank. After impressing the native chieftains with his military prowess he again withdrew without attempting a permanent occupation.

The Romans Secure a Foothold in Britain, 43 A.D. — Nearly a century elapsed before the Romans again took up the conquest of Britain. Cæsar was henceforth fully occupied in other parts of the Empire, and so were his successors, or else they had no inclination to extend the Roman boundaries in the direction of Britain. A change came with the Emperor Claudius to whom a pretender fled for assistance, though he was ready to seize any pretext for an intervention in British affairs. He was a Gaul by birth, and so, interested in the concerns of that part of the country, while furthermore he was anxious to celebrate the triumph which always followed a Roman conquest, so he sent his general, Aulus Plautius, to Britain in the year 43 A.D., and even came over in person at the final stage of the campaign. Britain was made a province and Claudius got his triumph. Thus began an occupation which lasted nearly four hundred years.

The Suppression of the Druids and the Insurrection of Boudicca. — The Druids were particularly active in opposing the extension of Roman influence. Solely from reasons of political necessity, for the Romans were usually fairly tolerant of other religions, the governor, Suetonius Paullinus, undertook the suppression of their order in the year 61 A.D. On his approach they took refuge in the little island of Mona (now Anglesey) off the Welsh coast. But there was no escape for them. The Roman soldiers "bore down upon them, smote all that opposed them to the earth," and destroyed their sacred grove. Meantime, events were happening in the east which forced Suetonius

BORMAY & CO., ENGR'S, N.Y.

to hurry back toward London. The Roman government had become unbearable. Excessive levies and financial extortion on the part of capitalists and tax-gatherers stirred the righteous wrath of the Britons. The climax came when Boadicea or Boudicca, widow of a native chief, stung by injustice and injury, raised a revolt of her people and those round about, who were already chafing under grievances. Camulodunum (Colchester), a colony of Roman veterans, was overcome and reduced to ashes, and Lundinium (London) and Verulamium (St. Albans) met a similar fate. Fully 70,000 Romans and their supporters are said to have been massacred. As the victorious Britons were returning from the destruction of Verulamium, Suetonius at length felt strong enough to strike. In a battle somewhere in the neighborhood of London he crushed the enemy and slaughtered numbers of a host of 80,000, including women and children who followed the army. Boudicca escaped her captors by taking poison. The vengeance of Suetonius was ruthless. "He made a desert, and called it a peace." Yet, in the long run, the uprising had the effect of softening the rigors of the Roman administration.

Agricola. — Under the governors who followed, inaction alternated with military suppression till the advent of Agricola (78–84), whose rule marks the highest point of the Roman supremacy. He replaced uncertain and heavy burdens by just and equal assessments; did away with monopolies; removed incompetent officials; fostered education and the use of the Latin language; and encouraged building. Furthermore he extended the imperial sway far to the north, and secured the lines of the Tyne and Solway and Forth and Clyde by a series of forts. He even penetrated beyond the Tay and defeated the wild Caledonians on the threshold of the Highlands. His last achievement, before his recall, was to send a fleet to circumnavigate the Island, thus for the first time determining its true geographical character.

The Last Two Centuries of the Roman Occupation. — Under his successors little attempt was made to hold the line north of the Tyne and the Solway,[1] while during the last two centuries of the Roman occupation, Britain itself was in a very unsettled state and often proved a thorn in the flesh of the Empire. Under weak rulers there was disorder and confusion; strong, ambitious governors, on the other hand, sought independence, or aimed to use the country as a basis of operations for seizing the imperial crown. Saxon and Frankish

[1] By the orders of the Emperor Hadrian this southern line of forts was reënforced by a wall of turf. The remarkable stone wall usually known as "Hadrian's Wall" — parts of which still remain — was probably not built until the time of Septimius Severus, who came over in 208 A.D.

pirates began to infest the eastern shore as early as the beginning of the third century, and, in the fourth, the northern Highlanders, now called Picts, reënforced by Scots coming originally from Ireland, became a constant menace to the border. To meet the pirates a new officer, the Count of the Saxon Shore, was created; but the first two Counts used their position to set up an independent rule instead of protecting the coast. The Roman power was finally restored in 296 by Constantius, father of the famous Emperor Constantine, founder of Constantinople. Meantime the Empire had been entirely reorganized under Diocletian (284–305). It was divided into four prefectures; these again were subdivided into dioceses, Britain forming one diocese of the prefecture of Gaul.

End of the Roman Occupation. — Even thus effectually reorganized the Empire was unable long to withstand the double strain of revolt from within and pressure from without. In 407 a pretender, who set himself up as Emperor, led the British legions into Gaul and, though he was overthrown, his troops were never marched back. The German barbarians had overrun the Empire. In 410 Alaric captured and sacked Rome. The Emperor Honorius bade the Britains henceforth defend themselves; they proved unequal to the task, and before the close of the century had to yield the greater part of their territory to the German tribes who swarmed across the Channel in constantly increasing numbers.

General Nature and Advantages of the Roman Rule. — The Roman occupation left few enduring traces on the history and life of Britain. While the thoroughness of the later Teutonic conquest was largely responsible for this, it was, to some degree, due to the fact that few of the Latin stock came to found homes. The remoteness, the severe climate, the gloomy skies, and the turbulence of the people repelled colonists. Settlement was confined to soldiers, government officials, merchants and traders. The few who took up large estates worked them mainly by natives. However, the period of Roman rule was not without its advantages. For some time it furnished a fairly effective protection against external foes and held in check the warring tribes within. The concerns of the subject peoples were regulated by the Roman law, a fusion of principle and practice superior to anything the world had yet seen. The application of a uniform legal system made for unity. A decree of Caracala, in 212, conferring the privilege of Roman citizenship on all free-born provincials contributed powerfully to break down provincial differences in Britain as well as elsewhere. While the general administration was kept in Roman hands, the Britons were given some training in local self-government by allowing them

membership in the district councils which were intrusted with the building of temples, erecting fortifications, and laying out streets. Theaters were constructed, which in spite of their corrupting influence made for education and culture. Remains of museums, baths, public buildings, and private dwellings show how far they had progressed in the art of living and in the comforts of civilized life. Aqueducts provided many communities with an abundant water supply, and the Romans had a superior system of heating by means of hypocausts, or hollow pipes, heated from an arched fire chamber below. Commerce and industry throve, protected by peace and wise laws and fostered by the building of roads and the growth of cities. A network of roads, so skillfully constructed that they have survived to excite our wonder even in the present day, provided alike for communication, the transportation of troops, and for transaction of all kinds of government business, as well as for the distribution of wares. Most of these roads ran through London, whose importance as a commercial center was foreshadowed thus early.

British Christianity. — One most significant result of the Roman occupation was the introduction of Christianity. Legends tell that the apostles Peter and Paul visited the land. A most beautiful story is that concerning Joseph of Arimathea who provided the sepulcher for Christ's burial; it was believed that he fled to far-off Britain bringing the holy grail or the cup used at the Last Supper, that he founded the famous abbey of Glastonbury, marking the site by planting his staff of thorn which grew into a tree and blossomed every Christmas morning in honor of the sacred day. But, much as these lovely and inspiring tales enrich our literature, it must be admitted that they rest on no historical foundation. Christianity was no doubt slowly introduced by Roman soldiers, merchants, and officials, and from the mission station in Gaul. The first evidence of any organized church is marked by the presence of three British bishops at a synod held at Arles in Gaul in 314 A.D. Within a century and a half the Teutons came and thrust a "wedge of heathendom" between the Christians of Britain and the Continent. During the long years when they were cut off from the mother Church at Rome they developed forms of worship and government distinctly peculiar to themselves in many respects. When they are next heard of, there was a British and a Scotch-Irish Church, both independent of the Bishop of Rome, and both different from the Roman usage in their method of computing the date on which Easter fell.

Evils and Disadvantages of Roman Rule. — While the Roman rule brought many advantages to Britain — peace, prosperity, increased

unity, improved communications, civilized arts, and Christianity—it brought burdens and evils as well. For one thing, it introduced taxes and exactions always burdensome and often destructive and crushing. Worst of all, these revenues were not collected by responsible officials but were let out to tax farmers who paid a fixed sum and squeezed what they could from the unfortunate payers. Money was lent at exorbitant rates. Perhaps worse than the financial burdens was the system of conscription which took men from their homes, usually for life, to form a part of the great military machine. "We pay a yearly tribute of our bodies," wrote one Briton in a pathetic narrative. Then the strange vices which came in with the conquerors had a disastrous effect on those who came in closest contact with them, while those more remote were excluded from any participation in affairs. Both causes operated to kill independence and patriotism. With the withdrawal of the legions, Roman political institutions, laws, language, and manners soon passed away, and it was too late for the natives to complete their own national edifice from the point where they had so long ago been stopped in their work. In Britain, as elsewhere, the tendencies preparing the way for a successful barbarian invasion had been long at work; heavy taxation, conscription, and exhausted revenues had bred discontent; private ambition and local feeling were stronger than Imperial loyalty; and the barbarians, enlisted in increasing numbers, were favorable to those outside who were knocking at the gates. At last the barriers gave way, and the enemy passed in.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

B. C. A. Windle, *Life in Early Britain* (1897); a good popular account. W. B. Dawkins, *Early Man in Britain* (1880); some of the author's views have been superseded. John Beddoe, *Races in Britain* (1885). C. I. Elton, *Origins of English History* (1890); a valuable work. J. Rhys, *Celtic Britain* (1904); contains valuable information mingled with details chiefly useful for the special student. E. Conybeare, *Roman Britain* (1903); brief and readable. W. Z. Ripley, *Races of Europe* (1899); excellent. H. D. Traill, *Social England* (new illus. ed. 6 vols., 1901); a coöperative work containing a mass of information on the non-political aspects of the subject, with bibliographies at the ends of chapters. Sir James Ramsay, *The Foundations of England* (vol. I, 1898); a detailed narrative with copious references to the sources. Charles Oman, *England before the Norman Conquest* (1910); this is the first of a series of seven volumes by different hands covering the history of England from the earliest times to the present. The volume is especially valuable as presenting the results of recent work on the Roman occupation. Thomas Hodgkin, *A Political History of England* (1906);

the first of another series, devoting twelve volumes to the political history of England with useful annotated lists of authorities. C. Gross, *Sources and Literature of English History* (2d ed., 1915) is a work of unique value, containing the only complete bibliography covering the whole period from the earliest times to 1485.

CHAPTER III

THE COMING OF THE ANGLO-SAXONS. THE "HEPTARCHY" AND STRUGGLE FOR SUPREMACY

The Britons after the Withdrawal of the Romans. — After the withdrawal of the Romans, the Britons seem to have resumed their old tribal organization, although for purposes of defense they chose a common leader or Gwledig. For years they fought a losing fight; but for good or ill, the Roman connection with Britain had been forever broken. Before a century had gone by, the Island had so far passed beyond the Imperial ken that the strangest stories were circulated about it. According to one current legend, Britain was a home for the spirits of the dead, and certain boatmen were exempt from tribute to the King of the Franks for rowing them across the Channel.

The Coming of the Jutes, Angles, and Saxons. — In 449, if the usual date can be accepted, a body of Jutes under their mythical leaders, Hengist and Horsa, effected a landing on the little island of Thanet off the coast of Kent. At any rate, some time about the middle of the fifth century the Jutes established themselves in Kent and their arrival marks the beginning of a continuous series of invasions culminating in the conquest of the Island by a body of German peoples whose racial traits, laws, and customs form the basis of those which prevail to-day, not only in Great Britain, but in every land where the English language is spoken.[1] Two other tribes joined the Jutes in the westward movement — the Angles and the Saxons. Their original home was in the coast country stretching from the eastern shore of the present Denmark to the mouth of the Rhine.

Earliest Accounts of the Germans at Home. — From Roman historians, notably from Julius Cæsar, and from Tacitus, who wrote about 100 A.D., we learn something in general about the Germans or Teutons, to which stock the three invading tribes belonged, while

[1] Though, in their native land, their basic ideas of individual freedom and local self-government were, in modern times, largely repudiated by Prussianized Germany.

among the Scandinavians, the most northern of the German peoples, a rich mythology has been preserved in their eddas or legends. They were pagans, worshiping the forces of nature, personified in great gods whose names have been preserved in the days of the week. Supreme over all was Woden (Wednesday) from whom ancient kings derived their descent; Thor (Thursday) was the god of storm and agriculture, whose chariot rumbling over the clouds caused the thunder and who produced the thunder-bolts by the blows of his mighty hammer; Tiu (Tuesday) was the god of war. Besides these great gods, their imaginations created all sorts of strange beings: giants; fire-breathing dragons; kobalds, mischievous demons of mines; nixies or water-sprites; tiny prankish elves and other spirits good and bad. Many of the modern fairy stories are drawn from the actual beliefs of our forefathers. They rarely had temples made with hands, but worshiped in sacred groves, or sometimes they reverenced a particular tree or set up a wooden column. After death, the valiant warrior was supposed to go to Valhalla and live forever amidst the highest joys they could picture, of constant feasting and fighting; the cowardly and selfish went to the cold and joyless underworld presided over by the goddess Hel. While we hear of priests, they had nothing like the organization or influence of the Druids. Worship was very rudimentary, and human sacrifices, usually of prisoners, not unheard of. The Germans who came to Britain soon left their paganism for Christianity, but many of their practices have survived. The feast of the Resurrection takes its name from Eastre, the goddess of dawn and the returning year, and children still follow the pleasant custom of hunting colored eggs on that day. Christmas falls within their Yuletide when they celebrated the winter solstice, or the time when our northern lands are turned farthest from the sun; the burning of the Yule-log is supposed to have originated in their old bonfire in honor of Thor, once a sun god; and from them we learned to decorate our Christmas trees.

Political Organization. — In the time of Tacitus the Germans had advanced to a settled form of agriculture, and, although the bulk of the land was owned by the tribes and families, there are traces at least of individual ownership. Tacitus tells us of a well-defined political organization. First there was the tribe or state. Some were governed by kings, but those in the far-off north were governed, in times of peace, by a council of chiefs, who prepared measures for the assembly consisting of all the free men of the tribe. They usually came armed to their meetings, which were mainly to decide questions of war and peace. The tribes were divided into districts presided

over by chiefs elected in the tribal assembly. These districts were settlements made by groups of families which had originally sent a hundred warriors to the army and an equal number to the judicial assembly. All except the more important cases were decided in these district assemblies by the people themselves, for the chief was in no sense a judge, but merely a chairman to voice the opinion of the majority.

Every district included several groups of kindred, each forming a free village community. Each household had its own dwelling, surrounded by a plot of ground, which was the property of the father of the family, while the arable land, owned by the kindred group, was reallotted every year at the meeting of the community. Some of these villages may have been under the control of a chief, but it is generally supposed that most of them managed their own affairs — a primitive example of the modern town meeting. They cultivated in common and used only a portion of the soil each season, allowing the remainder to rest or lie fallow. Meadows and woods were common to all.

Ranks among the Early Germans. — Society was graded into ranks or classes. In many states there was an hereditary nobility who claimed descent from the gods, and enjoyed personal distinction, but no political privilege by virtue of their descent. The bulk of the inhabitants were freemen distinguished from the lower orders by their long flowing hair, their right to bear arms, their right to attend the assemblies of the tribe and the district, and their right to share in the annual allotment of their village lands. Below them were a class of half-freed slaves or freedmen. Lowest of all were the bondmen, whose lives were absolutely at the disposal of their masters, to whom any one else who injured them was answerable. Each chief had a body of select companions, or *comites*, whom he supplied with horses and weapons and who fed and drank at his rude but plentiful table. In return, they fought by his side in time of war and helped him to while away the idle hours of peace. Such were the characteristics which the Angles, Jutes and Saxons transmitted to their new island home.

The Jutes and the Saxons. — The impelling cause for their migration seems to have been desire for more land due to their hunting and pastoral pursuits, to their wasteful system of agriculture and their general roving instincts; moreover, they were hard pressed by the tribes constantly sweeping upon them from the east. The Jutes, who occupied Kent, never expanded very far. The bulk of the lands south of the Thames fell to the lot of the Saxons. In 477 a band of South

Saxons landed on the coast at Selsey and appropriated to themselves the modern county of Sussex. In 495 Cerdic and his son Cynric — again the names of the leaders are only traditional — landed on the shores of Southampton Water, and their followers, known as the West Saxons, reënforced by some Jutes soon overran what is now the county of Hampshire. After a time they worked their way up to the Thames, but were stopped in their advance down the valley by the tribes who had pushed in from the eastern coast. The strip of coast between the Thames and the river Stour fell to a band who came to be known as the East Saxons, a name which survives in the modern Essex The Middle Saxons, stretching farther inland along the northern bank of the Thames, stood between them and their West Saxon kin. The latter, turning west after their failure to secure possession of the lower Thames valley, gained a decisive victory, in 577, at Deorham over three British kings, a victory which gave them control of the Severn River and enabled them to cut off the Welsh massed in Devon and Cornwall from those lying north of the Bristol Channel. Ceawlin, their leader at this time, pressed north, but a decided defeat some miles south of Chester, coupled with a revolt of the mixed population of Saxons and British settled in the Severn valley, stopped the growth of the West Saxon power for over two hundred years.

The Angles. — By far the greater part of present England was occupied in the sixth century by the Angles, who gave their name to the country — Angle-land or England. Lying between the River Stour and the Wash were the East Angles, made up of the North Folk and the South Folk. North of the Humber and stretching beyond the borders of present Scotland were the Northumbrians, consisting of two peoples, the Deirans and the Bernicians. Along the Trent, running into the heart of the midlands, were the Middle English, and still farther west, on the British border, were the men of the Mark or Mercians.

Tribal Grouping at the Close of the Teutonic Invasions. — Leaving the minor tribes out of account, we have now noted the settlements of the various peoples who came to compose what was formerly called the "Heptarchy," or Seven Kingdoms, though the number varies and the name has little significance: three kingdoms of Angles — Northumbrians, East Angles, and Mercians; three kingdoms of Saxons — East, South, and West — and Kent, the kingdom of the Jutes. To the north and west were the Celts, mingled with remnants of earlier peoples.

Slightness of Roman or Celtic Influences on Anglo-Saxon Britain. — The Romans left very slight permanent influences on the country.

while the Teuton invaders had gone from their homes comparatively untouched by the brilliant if decaying civilization of the great Latin race. So the manners and customs and forms of government of the English are, to a large degree, Teutonic, not Roman or even Celtic. The invaders found a British people enjoying some degree of culture, advanced in trade, living in cities and cultivating large estates. But they either exterminated them or drove them into the inaccessible west, sparing chiefly women and slaves. The English medieval towns are to be traced from the rural settlements of the Anglo-Saxons, not from the vills and cities of the partly Romanized Celts. Many of these latter communities were utterly destroyed and have only been excavated in recent times, while the original sites of others were only centuries later repeopled.

Union into Larger Kingdoms and Introduction of Christianity. — Two main features mark the period following the invasions. One is the union of the various incoming tribes into larger kingdoms,[1] and the attempts of the larger and stronger of these kingdoms — Northumbria in the seventh, Mercia in the eighth, and Wessex in the ninth centuries — to obtain control over the whole Island. The progress toward unity was helped and hindered in many ways; but the early combinations were due mainly to two causes — the subjugation of the weaker by the stronger, and the union of neighboring tribes for defense and conquest. The other notable feature of the period is the conversion of the invaders to Christianity, which proved to be a great unifying force. The form which was to prevail, that of Rome, was introduced in the southeast, while Scotch and Irish missionaries worked their way in from the north and west.

Augustine Converts Æthelbert of Kent. — The first of the new rulers to adopt the Christian faith was Æthelbert, King of Kent (560–616), who married Bertha, a Frankish princess and a Christian, though the conversion of the King and his people was actually brought about by a mission from Rome. The Pope at this time was Gregory the Great (590–604). Already, as a young man, he had seen young English captives in the slave market at Rome, and much attracted by their fair faces, blue eyes, and silky golden hair, he asked whence they came. He was informed that they came from the country of the Angles. "Right," said he, "for they have angelic faces." On asking further the name of the province to which they belonged he was told that it was Deira. "Truly," he exclaimed, "they shall be

[1] The West Saxons, for instance, were originally composed of many smaller groups, the Dorsaetas, Somersaetas, and Wiltsaetas, to mention only a few, and the same may be said of the other kingdoms.

BORMAY & CO., ENGR'S, N.Y.

withdrawn from the wrath of God [1] and called to the mercy of Christ." From that time, according to this legend, so beautiful that one hopes it may be true, he seems to have been determined to convert the land of the Anglo-Saxons to the Christian faith. So, in the year 596, he selected a monk, Augustine, and a band of followers to perform this work. It is easy to see why he chose the country of Æthelbert, the leading man in southern Britain, the best known on the Continent and the husband of a Christian. In 597 Gregory's emissaries landed in Thanet, whence Augustine sent word to the King that they brought him a joyful message. Æthelbert arranged to receive them sitting in the open air, fearing if he entered a house they might overcome him by magic spells. The monks approached him in a procession, bearing a silver cross and a picture of Christ painted on wood and singing the litany, and told him of the Gospel. After some hesitation he allowed the holy strangers to come and dwell in his royal city of Canterbury, and on Whitsunday, 597, he consented to be baptized. It is said that 10,000 of his people followed his example, possibly from conviction, possibly from loyalty or by royal command. From that time to the present day, the Archbishop of Canterbury has been at the head of the Church of England.

End of the Kentish Supremacy and the Decline of Christianity. — Pope Gregory had also instructed Augustine to enter into relations with the British Christians; but their Bishops, although they met him in two conferences, sullenly refused to join hands with one associated with their hated conquerors. Augustine died in 604, having done little more than spread his faith into the neighboring East Saxon land. After the death of Æthelbert, in 616, his sons and the East Saxon chiefs relapsed into heathendom. Æthelbert was the leading ruler in the country and the Kentish supremacy perished with him. His reign is notable not only for the introduction of Christianity, but for the first book of laws issued by an English King. They are merely a record of existing customs, somewhat amended by Christianity, and relate chiefly to offenses and penalties to be imposed.

The Rise of Northumbria. — Meantime, the Northumbrians had come to the front and developed a power that was destined to be supreme for over a century. In 593 Æthelfrith of the house of Bernicia, whose father had gained control of the rival kingdom of Deira, became King. Known as " the devastator " from the extent and ruthlessness of his conquests, he first secured his northern border by a victory over a combined force of the Picts and Scots and then advanced west against the Welsh whom he overcame at a battle near Chester at a

[1] Latin, *de ira.*

date variously given as 607 and 613. Legend tells that two thousand monks from Bangor appeared to pray for their countrymen, whereupon the Northumbrian King ordered an attack upon them, declaring: "if they cry to their God against us, they, too, are our adversaries, though they bear no weapons, since they oppose us by their imprecations." Be this as it may, the battle of Chester ranks with that of Deorham (Dyrham) in importance, for it had the result of cutting off the Strathclyde Welsh from the inhabitants of the country we now know as Wales. Thus the solid Celtic western wall had been broken into three parts. Æthelfrith did not long survive his triumph for he was defeated and slain in 617.

Supremacy of Edwin (617–633). His Conversion. — Edwin, an exiled Deiran prince, thereby became supreme over the united Northumbrian Kingdoms. He extended his rule to the north, and established a fortification from which Edinburgh (Edwin's burh) takes its name. He also made himself the leading power in mid-Britain and allied himself in marriage with a Kentish princess, whose chaplain strove to convert him to the Christian faith. Edwin, after a narrow escape from death, promised to adopt it, if he should succeed in gaining a victory over the West Saxons with whom he was at war. When his arms prevailed he held a meeting of his Witan, or Council, to discuss the question. History has preserved for us the lofty, simple words of one of his councilors. "So seems the life of man, Oh King," he said, "as a sparrow's flight through the hall when a man is sitting at meat in winter tide with the warm fire lighted at the hearth; but the chill rain-storm without. The sparrow flies in at one door and tarries for a moment in the light and heat of the hearth fire, and then flying forth from the other, vanishes into the wintry darkness whence it came. So tarries for a moment the life of man in our sight; but what is before it we know not. What after it we know not. If this new teaching tell us aught certainly of these, let us follow it." This was in 627. Edwin not only extended his sway over a considerable portion of the Island, but he maintained such peace and order that a woman might walk from sea to sea and no one would do her harm. But his enemies in the end proved too strong for him and Christianity contributed to his undoing. A King of North Wales formed a combination with Penda of Mercia, a stout old pagan, and the two overthrew him in 633.

Oswald, King of Northumbria. The Scotch-Irish Mission. — After an interval Edwin was succeeded by Oswald, a son of the Bernician, Æthelfrith. During the time of Edwin he had been in exile chiefly at Iona, a little island off the west coast of Scotland where

there was a famous monastery founded in the sixth century by the Irish Saint Columba. Oswald — noted for his humbleness, piety, and charity — labored to convert his kingdom to the Scotch-Irish faith, which he had adopted at Iona, and was ably assisted by Aidan, a gentle and holy man, who established a monastery at Lindisfarne, or Holy Isle, on the Northumbrian coast not far from the royal residence. Although Oswald was a strong and valiant warrior as well as a man of piety, he was not long able to maintain headway against Penda, who led an army against him and defeated him in 642. Oswald was slain, and miracles were performed by earth soaked with his blood. Oswy, a younger brother, was able at last to overcome old Penda, in 655, a triumph which accelerated the work that the Scotch-Irish Church was doing. Meantime, the Roman Church had secured a foothold in East Anglia and in Wessex, and a clash between the rivals was bound soon to come.

Triumph of the Church of Rome. Organization and Extension under Theodore. — Finally, in 664, a synod was arranged in the presence of King Oswy at Whitby, where Wilfrid, a young Northumbrian noble, who had just returned from a pilgrimage to the Eternal City, presented the Roman claims. The main controversy was over the date of Easter. In the course of the debate Wilfrid asserted that the Roman custom was that of Peter to whom Christ had intrusted the keys of heaven. This decided Oswy, who declared that he would take the side of Peter, lest "when I come before the gates of heaven, he who holds the keys should not open unto me." The results of the Roman victory at Whitby were momentous and far-reaching. It brought England into contact with the civilization of continental Europe and led to the formation of what had been a mere group of mission stations into an organized Church. The man to whom this work is chiefly due was Theodore of Tarsus, whom the Pope sent out as Archbishop of Canterbury, and who worked unceasingly from 669 till his death in 690. He found seven bishoprics and only three bishops to fill them; he left fifteen in effective working order. To bring the Church into closer touch with the people he greatly extended the parochial system,[1] and established a school at Canterbury where boys were taught arithmetic, astronomy, Latin, Greek, and the Scriptures.

[1] The center of church life in primitive times was the bishop. To each was allotted a single church, and he had in his household a body of young men whom he taught and sent out to preach and teach in their turn. But, corresponding to a need for more regular ministrations, as time went on, the lords of large estates began to settle priests on their lands, and the little townships or hamlets did likewise; thus parishes originated.

The Monks and Their Work. — The religious and educational work of the Church in early England was largely done by the monks. In the Anglo-Saxon period these monastic orders were mostly Benedictine, following the rule of St. Benedict (480–543), a holy man who founded a monastery at Monte Cassino in southern Italy. His followers were pledged never to marry, to obey their superiors without question, and to accumulate no wealth for themselves; in other words, they were bound by the three vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience. While the individuals remained poor, the monastic communities became immensely rich. Enjoined to labor as well as to pray, they entered into waste places, cut down the forests, drained the swamps, built dwellings, and cultivated the soil. Aside from their manual labor they studied and copied manuscripts and taught the youth. Unhappily these monks, as their wealth increased and their pioneer work was accomplished, became weak, idle, and corrupt; nevertheless, after all is said, they were a great power for good. Life was hard, brutal, and vicious, and the gentle, pious men and women who devoted themselves to study, work, and prayer were shining examples in an age when greed, ignorance, and bloodthirstiness were all too common. The literature of the times is full of the doings of monks and nuns.

The Venerable Bede (673–735). — By far the most renowned and attractive figure among these early monks is the venerable Bede (673–735), the "father of English history." His *Ecclesiastical History of the English Nation*, extending from 55 B.C. to 731 A.D., is notable not only for being the first truly historical work produced by an Englishman, but also for a grace of style and temper that is all but unique. Although primarily a church history, it deals incidentally with temporal affairs, and indeed is almost our only authentic source for the period of the seventh and early eighth centuries. As a boy Bede was sent to the monastery of Jarrow on Tyne and passed his life there. He says "he gave his whole energy to meditating on the Scriptures, and, amid the observance of the monastic rule and the daily ministry of singing in the Church, ever held it sweet either to learn or to teach or to write." Humble and devout, he became the most learned man of his day.

Influence of the Church. — The influence of the Church in those days was manifold. Its organization furnished a model of unity in the midst of separation and disorder. Its synods brought men together and broke down provincialism and prejudice. It contributed at least somewhat to raise the standard of morality, and to preserve and spread learning. It fostered industry, agriculture, and the arts;

while the monks builded and studied and dug, the nuns spun, wove, and embroidered. Moreover, many Englishmen became famous and heroic apostles to their kinsmen on the Continent.

End of the Northumbrian Supremacy. — Oswy of Northumbria died in 670, and Northumbria soon ceased to be a leading power. Internal strife, hostilities on the northern border, and the enmity of Mercia proved too much for it to withstand. The kingdom lingered on till it was destroyed in the ninth century by a new enemy, the Northmen; but it would be useless to try to make headway through its confused and tumultuous annals. Suffice to say that during the eighth century there were fourteen kings, of whom many were deposed and none died peacefully.

Supremacy of Mercia. Offa (757–796). — During the eighth century the leading position in England was taken by Mercia. Mercian power reached its height under Offa (757–796), who after more than twenty years of hard fighting succeeded in securing his supremacy south of the Humber and in subduing and absorbing the Welsh on the western border. He was on terms of intimacy with Charlemagne and more than one sign indicates his influence with the Papacy: Pope Hadrian described him as the King of the English nation; and he made the Pope a grant, in 787, which is regarded as the origin of Peter's pence. Offa also made laws for his people, which, while they are no longer extant, were drawn on by Alfred the Great for his later and more famous compilation.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

Cæsar in his *Gallic Wars* and Tacitus in his *Germania* describe the conditions of the early Germans on the Continent in about 50 B.C. and 100 A.D. respectively.

Among the descriptions in later works are: Pasquali Villari, *The Barbarian Invasions* (1902); F. B. Gummere, *Germanic Origins* (1892); Hannis Taylor, *The Origin and Growth of the English Constitution* (vol. I, 1892); Wm. Stubbs, *English Constitutional History* (5th ed., 1891) I, chs. II, III. Taylor's work is a compilation which is very clearly written, but exaggerates the Germanic origin of English institutions. Stubbs, although superseded in places, is still the authoritative comprehensive work on English constitutional history in the Middle Ages. Among the best of the briefer manuals are: A. B. White, *The Making of the English Constitution* (1908); F. W. Maitland, *The Constitutional History of England* (1908); and T. P. Taswell-Langmead, *English Constitutional History* (7th ed., 1911). A very suggestive sketch is G. B. Adams, *An Outline Sketch of English Constitutional History* (1918). D. J. Medley, *Manual of English Constitutional History* (4th ed., 1907) is a most useful work of reference.

For invasions and the early history of the Anglo-Saxons, the most valuable general sources are Bede, *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum*, to 731, and the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, which in one version goes to 1154. Each work has been translated many times. Inexpensive editions are those of J. A. Giles in Bohn's Standard Library, (1843) and (1847) respectively. The best modern narratives are J. R. Green, *The Making of England* (1881); Ramsay, *Foundations of England*, I; Oman, *England before the Norman Conquest*, and Hodgkin, *Political History of England*.

For the introduction of Christianity, see H. O. Wakeman, *History of the Church of England* (8th ed., 1914), and William Hunt, *History of the English Church* (1901). Wakeman's is the best one-volume work. Hunt's is the first of a series of nine volumes by different authors. Each chapter is provided with a fairly full bibliography. F. Makower, *Constitutional History of the Church of England* (Eng. tr., 1895) is very good on the organization of the Church.

An invaluable work of reference for the whole period is the *Dictionary of National Biography*, 63 vols., 1885–1900, with 6 supplementary volumes bringing the work up to 1912. The ample biographies are accompanied by good bibliographies. In 1908–1909 a cheaper edition in 22 volumes was issued.

CHAPTER IV

THE ASCENDANCY OF THE WEST SAXONS. THE GROWTH AND DECLINE AND FALL OF THE ANGLO-SAXON MONARCHY

Rise of the West Saxons. Ine (688–725). — Not long after the death of Offa, the Mercians were forced to yield their supreme position to the West Saxons, who had started on a career of conquest with the brightest of prospects generations before, but had been held back largely by internal dissensions. The greatest of their early Kings after the warrior Ceawlin (593) was Ine (688–725), celebrated for his commanding position in the south and for his code of laws — largely amendments of existing custom and an enumeration of crimes and their penalties. After reigning nearly forty years Ine abdicated and went on a pilgrimage to Rome, where he died. Nearly a century was to pass before the West Saxon power again took the lead. Then its supremacy among the Anglo-Saxons was destined to be lasting. Many reasons explain this: there began in the ninth century a series of Kings who were, almost without exception, effective rulers and indomitable warriors; they were supported by the Church, which saw the best prospect of carrying on its work under a strong united monarchy; and finally, the invasions of the Northmen destroyed the rival kingdoms which had impeded the West Saxon advance and drew the divided peoples together against a common enemy.

Egbert (802–839) Establishes the West Saxon Supremacy. — The beginning of the West Saxon supremacy dates from the accession of Egbert, who, during some years of exile, dwelt in the domain of Charlemagne, from whose vast Empire he gained his first ideas of a great united rule. On the death of the King who had driven him out he returned, in 802, and was accepted as ruler by the West Saxons. He reduced the Mercians to submission; the people of East Anglia sought his "peace and protection"; he recovered the Kentish kingdom of his father; and he forced the Northumbrians and Welsh to take him for their lord. During his last years he had to fight off attacks of the Northmen who had first appeared in the reign of his predecessor,

and who were to occupy practically the whole energies of Egbert's son and of his four grandsons.

The Northmen. — The Northmen, or Danes, as the Anglo-Saxons called them, — often known as the "vikings" or rovers — inhabited the peninsulas of Denmark, Norway, and Sweden. They were heathens, sea rovers, and pirates who passed their time mainly in plundering and fighting. Organized in small bands, they had their headquarters in the innumerable fiords, inlets, and creeks which indented the Scandinavian coast. Their boats were small open affairs, high at the prow and stern, propelled by oars, though often they bore a single mast and sail which could be set up to help the oarsmen when the wind was right. While they founded powerful states in northwest France (Normandy) and in southern Italy, we are concerned primarily with the Northmen in England. At first they conducted merely disconnected plundering expeditions, then they made settlements, and finally established kingdoms.

The Danes in England. — In 793 they landed at Lindisfarne, where they "lamentably destroyed God's church . . . through rapine and slaughter." During the course of the next century the invaders secured territorial settlements in northern and eastern England, overrunning Northumbria, East Anglia, and Mercia. In 795 they landed in Ireland, where they later established a kingdom. As has been seen, they proved, from the time of Egbert, a serious menace to the West Saxons. They not only infested the southern and southeastern coasts, but, during the reign of his son, they penetrated inland[1] and even took London and Canterbury. While Æthelred, a grandson of Egbert, was ruling the West Saxons and straining every nerve to drive the Danes out of his territory, he was mortally wounded in 871.

Alfred the Great (871–901). — Æthelred left two sons; but they were under age, and Alfred, who had so ably assisted his brother, was chosen to succeed him as King of Wessex and Kent. That the kingdoms of Wessex and Kent were defended against the Danes and organized to form a center for the ultimate recovery of the whole Island was due to Alfred, the supreme hero of the English race. He was born in 848, and from his infancy he was marked as a child of special attainments

[1] A raid into East Anglia in 870 is notable for the gruesome martyrdom of the King of that land. St. Edmund, as he came to be, refused to divide his treasure with the Danish chief, to renounce his religion, or to become a vassal. Forthwith he was tied to a tree, scourged, then shot through with arrows and beheaded. Long after, a shrine was built to commemorate his martyrdom at Bury, now known as Bury St. Edmunds.

and charm; his later youth was spent in hard and stern duties, and he was only twenty-two when the whole burden of defending the kingdom fell on him. The darkest time in the annals of England came in 876, when, after a brief truce, Guthrum, who had made himself King of East Anglia, landed on the south coast, overran Dorsetshire and seized Exeter. Alfred retreated to the fen country of Somerset,[1] and established a fortress on an inaccessible island in the marshes. After he had brought together the men of Hampshire, Wiltshire, and Somerset he sallied forth and defeated the Danes in 878 at Ethandun (now Hedington). By the so-called Peace of Wedmore (879) Alfred made them consent to receive baptism and to evacuate the West Saxon land. It was not till 886, after he had defeated the Danes in a sea fight north of the Thames, that Alfred got a treaty dividing his land from what came to be known as the Danelagh. By the terms of that treaty the Danes were to keep all east of a line "up the Thames to the mouth of the Lea, up the Lea to its source, thence across to Bedford, thence up the Ouse to Watling Street." Thereby Alfred got London, which he fortified and rebuilt.

Alfred's Military Reorganization. — Having driven out the enemy, he set himself to organize a permanent defense, to give his people wise laws, to improve their political institutions, to educate them and furnish them with a literature. The chief military weakness of the English had been the fact that, as soon as a battle was won, the army would disperse and leave the land unprotected. To prevent this, Alfred divided the men into three parts; one was kept at work in the fields, another was held constantly under arms, and still a third was assigned to garrison strongholds or fortresses.

His Laws and Political Reorganization. — Having prepared for defense he proceeded to compile a body of laws. Besides a few new provisions and some taken directly from the Scriptures he selected what to him "seemed good" from those his "forefathers held" from the dooms of Æthelbert of Kent, from Ine of Wessex, and Offa of Mercia, besides taking some provisions directly from the Scriptures. It was a decided step in unification to give his subjects a common law where each people had had its own particular system, moreover his influence on the political institutions of his time is not without significance. The invention of shires[2] has been attributed to Alfred, but

[1] The story is that he was a fugitive in hiding and that once he took refuge in a cowherd's hut where the housewife gave him some cakes to tend. He allowed them to burn and was sharply berated for his carelessness. This story is a myth, nor indeed, did Alfred come as a fugitive, but to gather new strength against his enemies.

[2] For shires, see below p. 45.

the arrangement for Wessex is at least as old as Ine. What Alfred did was to perfect it and extend it to the old tribal kingdoms of Kent, Surrey, Sussex, and Essex which had, up to the period of his victories, been ruled by one or more under-kings of the royal family. From the time of Alfred all lands south of the Thames formed part of the West Saxon kingdom, divided into judicial and administrative districts each under regular officials. The arrangement offered an admirable combination of local self-government and central organization; for, while the forms of procedure were popular, the presiding officers were responsible to the King. Alfred spent much time in deciding complaints. He always favored the poor, "because," he said, "the poor had no friend but the King."

His Work in Promoting Literature and Education. — Another phase of Alfred's varied activity is his work as a promoter of education and literature. Often lamenting that his own attainments in reading were so poor and that learning had reached such a low ebb in these turbulent times, it was his wish that "all the youth of England of free men . . . be set to learn . . . until that they are well able to read English writing," and "that those whom it is proposed to educate further and promote to a higher office should be taught Latin." For the latter purpose he caused a Court school to be founded at Winchester. Also he did much to foster the writing of his native tongue: under his auspices the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, the first history of any modern country in the vernacular, was greatly expanded; he started a collection of ancient epics of which only one, *Beowulf*, has survived, and caused various books to be translated, chief among them Bede's *History*. Probably the actual translations were made by the learned men he gathered about him, yet the renderings were Alfred's, and he interspersed them with little comments, bits of historical and geographical information and lofty sentiments which he thought would inform and uplift his people.

Final Estimate of Alfred. — Such was the work of Alfred, defender, lawgiver, and educator of his people. He was a man of many interests but one aim — to serve those over whom he ruled. Always active and methodical in his activity, he was so careful of his time that, it is said, since there were no clocks, he devised a candle covered by a lantern to measure the hours that were all too brief for what he had to do. He did not invent shires, found Oxford, or establish trial by jury as our forefathers believed. The burden of achievements attributed to him is greater than he can bear. But he did much for England, and, if we can see him aright through the distorting medium of myth and fable, he was just as great for what he was and what he did.

Edward the Elder (900–924), and the Beginning of Reconquest. — Alfred died 28 October, 900, and was succeeded by his son Edward, the Elder, who undertook to conquer all England from the Danes and to extend his overlordship over the Scots and the Welsh. While Edward himself was a persistent and able general he owed much to his sister Ethelfleda, "the Lady of the Mercians," whose military achievements surpassed those of the Amazons of old. Edward and Ethelfleda developed the method of warfare originated by Alfred; avoiding battles whenever possible, they seized commanding points, which they fortified and garrisoned as centers of defense and further conquest. Before the close of his reign, Edward, and his valiant sister († 918) had recovered Essex and East Anglia and a large portion of the Mercian district of the five boroughs. He had also extended his overlordship over the Northumbrians and the Welsh, and it is asserted that the King of the Scots also took Edward "to father and lord";[1] but this is disputed, although later English Kings based a claim on Scotland on this alleged submission. We hear of subsequent revolts even in the districts which Edward had actually conquered, but he had good ground for being called King of the Anglo-Saxons. His work was finally completed by his sons, three of whom in turn succeeded him.

Further Extension of the West Saxon Power. — The first of these was Athelstan (925–940), known as "Glorious Athelstan," from his grace and beauty. His growing power and reconquests — he wrote himself Monarch of all Britain — caused alarm to the princes on his borders, and, in 937, the Scots, Welsh, and Danes combined against him. He met the coalition at Brunnanburh, an undetermined site somewhere in the north country, where a desperate hand to hand battle was fought from sunrise to sunset, resulting in a victory for Athelstan which determined that the West Saxons were to be supreme in Britain. The second son had to face a series of revolts, and only managed by hard fighting to retain what his father and brother had won. The third, Edred, though he waged persistent war against the restless Danes in Northumberland, adopted, in 954, the year before his death, a new policy; he put them under an Ealdorman, and allowed them their own customs and their own laws — a policy of wise moderation that resulted ultimately in incorporating the Danes as peaceful subjects.

St. Dunstan, His Reforms, Political Influence and Banishment. — It was in the reign of Edred that Dunstan came to take a leading share

[1] The Picts had already in the middle of the ninth century been united with the Scots under one King.

in the government. Born about 924 of a noble West Saxon family, Dunstan was educated at the monastery of Glastonbury and early introduced to the court of Athelstan where he spent much of his time. He was a dreamy, imaginative youth who cared little for the pastimes of his fellows. After he had been banished from court on a false charge of sorcery and after a serious illness he decided to become a monk. At Glastonbury he built himself a tiny cell, where he spent his time studying the Scriptures, copying and illuminating manuscripts, skillfully working metals and playing the harp, though, in spite of his manifold occupations, he was frequently assailed by horrid visions and temptations from the Evil One. Eventually he was made Abbot. In his new position, Dunstan led a movement in England to meet the decay in religion and learning that had set in as early as the time of Bede, and which had been accentuated by the disorders resulting from the Danish invasions. Monks and nuns had departed from the rules of their orders, had married, had assumed the dress and manners and customs of the laity, had lost interest in study and entered into the pursuits and pastimes of those in the world about them. Dunstan set himself against all this. He introduced monks at Glastonbury, pledged to live the single life and to devote themselves to study and the services of the Church, and worked untiringly as a teacher himself. But, in addition to his work as Abbot, he accomplished a great political work as well; for Edred made him chief adviser, and it was probably due to Dunstan's sage counsel that the device was adopted of conciliating the Danes by granting them a measure of local independence. Under Edred's nephew he lost influence for a time. The West Saxons hated him for his opposition to their plan of establishing their ascendancy by force, and he crossed the purposes of an ambitious woman who was bent on marrying her daughter to the young and weak-minded King. Consequently, Dunstan was banished. He remained two years in exile, where he learned much at first hand of the revived and developed Benedictine rule, known as the "Cluniac" reform from the fact that it began at Cluny in France. Dunstan, however, was more interested in education and religion than in monastic discipline, and it is due more to others that the stricter aspects of the reform were introduced into England.

Recall of Dunstan. Edgar, the Peaceful (959–975).—Dunstan was recalled and made Archbishop of Canterbury by Edgar, whose reign marks the highest point in the power of kingship in the Anglo-Saxon period. The royal policy was consolidation on the basis of conciliation; the Danes were to have their laws and so were the English: while the King was supreme over all, the local government was in the

hands of the great Ealdormen of Northumbria; East Anglia, and Mercia. This was an extension of the policy which had been initiated largely by Dunstan in the reign of Edred, and it worked well under Edgar's vigorous control, but there was danger, realized all too soon under weak rulers, that local divisions would break up the unity of the kingdom. Edgar was crowned in 973, and "there was much bliss on that blessed day." The coronation is notable as the first which the records describe in detail. The King entered the Church wearing his crown, which he took off as he knelt before the altar. A *Te Deum* was sung, after which the bishops raised the King, and the coronation oath was administered by Dunstan, who presided. Edgar swore "that the Church of God and all Christian people should enjoy true peace forever, that he would forbid all wrong and robbery to all degrees, and that he would command justice and mercy in all judgments." Then prayers were said, the Archbishop anointed him, and the people in the church shouted "Let the King live forever." Next Dunstan girded him with a sword, placed a ring on his finger, the crown on his head, a scepter in his hand, and, assisted by the Archbishop of York, seated him on the throne. Later, the time when Edgar's law prevailed was looked back to as a golden age.

Æthelred the Redeless (978–1016). Beginning of Decline of Royal Power. — With his death, Dunstan's influence ceased and troubles began. His eldest son, a mere boy, Edward, known in time to come as "The Martyr," was murdered by the followers of his wicked stepmother to make way for her own son Æthelred. Æthelred, as he grew to manhood, showed himself incompetent to rule his country in the troublous times that came upon it. While by no means wanting in ability or energy, he would not listen to wisdom or good counsel, hence his name of the "Redeless" or "Unready." Soon the great Ealdormen in the different districts set about making themselves independent of royal control, and Æthelred made matters worse in seeking to counteract them by raising new favorites to power and endowing them with land. They naturally sought to advance their own interests, and thus Æthelred only made new whips to scourge himself.

The Second Coming of the Danes. — In the midst of this turmoil the Danes reappeared, and this time they continued their attacks till they established themselves as rulers of the whole kingdom. They began, in 980, with some predatory raids in which Swein, son of the Danish King, figured, while, in 991, after an overwhelming force had won a bloody battle at Maldon in Essex, "it was decreed that tributes should be given to the Danish men, on account of the great terror which

they caused by the seacoast." The money was raised by a tax on land called Danegeld, which, continued long after the danger was past, was, for some time, the only land tax raised in the country. Æthelred failed to take advantage of the respites which he frequently purchased, to compose the differences between his warring lords and to develop a strong army and navy. However, the condition of the country as well as the indecision of the King must be taken into account. A great part of the resources in men and money were in the hands of the great territorial nobles who were at odds with Æthelred, yet even when the King's officials could be depended upon, they had, as a fighting force, only the ill-organized shire levies. At first the Danish custom was to land at unexpected places, mount on horses, ride " as far as they would," burning, plundering, and " man-slaying " and doing " unspeakable evil," and, by the time the English were prepared to meet them, seek their ships and slip away. Then, later, they came in irresistible forces, won battles and had to be bought off.

At the mercy of the invaders as he was, Æthelred brought dire vengeance on the English by a very stupid as well as brutal step. Alarmed at the rumor of a Danish plot to seize his kingdom, he ordered a general massacre of all those of that race to be found dwelling in the land, on St. Brice's day, 13 November, 1002. This fell deed brought Swein — now king of Denmark and Norway — into the country again. Year after year the poor English were subject to his attacks, and to those of other bands as well.

The Danes Gain a Foothold. — A crisis came in 1013, the beginning of the end, when Swein, accompanied by his son Cnut, landed with a great force at the mouth of the Humber. The Northumbrians, the Mercians, and the West Saxons submitted in quick succession; even London, which at first held out, saw the futility of further resistance. The acceptance of Swein amounted to a practical deposition of Æthelred, who retired in 1014 to the court of Duke Richard of Normandy, whose sister Emma he had married in 1002, on the eve of his disastrous massacre of the Danes. Within a month after Æthelred's flight, old Swein suddenly dropped dead; while the Danes chose Cnut to succeed him, the English recalled Æthelred who, in spite of his promises, accomplished little. He did, in a fitful burst of energy, try to drive Cnut out of England; but the latter soon returned and was in possession of western and northern England when Æthelred died in 1016.

Cnut Overcomes Edmund Ironside. — Thereupon, the people of London proclaimed as King, Edmund — known because of his valor as Edmund Ironside — Æthelred's son by a nameless mother. But

the bulk of the English, led by a traitorous Ealdorman of Mercia, declared for Cnut. After an uphill fight, finally defeated at Assandun (Ashington) in Essex, Edmund was forced to consent to a partition of the kingdom; but died a few days after the treaty, so opportunely that it has been believed he was murdered, and Cnut became the undisputed King of all England. Edmund's sons were sent out of the country, some say to be slain; but they found a refuge in Hungary, while Æthelred's sons by Emma were in safe keeping in the court of the Norman dukes.

Reign of Cnut (1016–1035). — Cnut had shown himself crafty, bloody, and ruthless in his rise to power, and during the first years of his rule he was merciless and unscrupulous in disposing of those who stood in his way, yet, once seated firmly on the throne, he ruled as a wise and just King and sought to govern in the interests of his English subjects. If naturally cruel and greedy of power, he sought to restrain his instincts. Recognizing the necessity of the situation, he followed the recent practice and organized the country into four great earldoms, Northumbria, Mercia, East Anglia, and Wessex, though, later at least, there were many smaller ones besides. In 1018 he held a Witan, or assembly of his wise men, at Oxford where "Danes and Englishmen" agreed to live "under the laws of King Edgar." This meant simply that the old laws of the English as they were in Edgar's time were to be observed, and this was the spirit of all Cnut's enactments. He pledged himself to "rule rightly," while the people, in their turn, were to "love God and be true to King Cnut." When Cnut died in 1035 in the full vigor of his manhood, his dominion included not only England, but Denmark, Norway, and Southern Sweden as well. On the other hand, by a victory at Carham, in 1018, which the Scots gained over his northern subjects, he was obliged to cede Lothian, formerly a part of Northumbria, and to recognize the Tweed as the boundary between the English and the Scots. Many stories are told of him which if not true, at least indicate the estimate in which he was held.[1] The favorable judgment of the time seems to be justified by his acts: he was wise enough to identify himself with his people,

[1] On one occasion his courtiers urged him to sit in a chair by the seaside and bid the waves stop. When they came on, regardless of the royal presence, he refused to wear his crown again "because the honor belonged to God alone, the true ruler of the world." Perhaps the prettiest of all is that which tells how he listened to the singing of the monks of Ely.

> "Cheerful sang the monks in Ely
> As Cnut the King rode by.
> 'Row to the shore, lads,' said the King,
> 'And let us hear the Churchmen sing.'"

and if he sought his own interests, they were England's interests as well.

Return to the Old English Line. Edward the Confessor (1042–1066). — The reigns of Cnut's two sons, from 1035 to 1042, were years of disorder, bloodshed, and heavy taxation. Neither left an heir, so on the death of the second of this evil pair the English joyfully proclaimed as King, Edward, sole surviving son of Æthelred and Emma.

Edward was royal in his bearing, affable and gentle as well; but he was utterly lacking in decision and not above spite, petty meanness, or even worse. Yet his reputation for personal holiness was so high — he is said to have abolished the Danegeld because he saw the devil sitting on the money bags — that he was popularly called the "Confessor" and was actually made a saint within a century after his death. Having passed the greater part of his life in Normandy his interests were more distinctively Norman than English. He brought over a number of Norman followers, who succeeded in not only securing themselves wealth and offices but also a voice in his counsels — chief among them was Robert of Jumiéges who became Archbishop of Canterbury in 1051. But Godwine, the stanchest champion of English interests, whom Cnut had made Earl of Wessex, was allowed to retain his office, and Edward married his daughter, a lady of more learning than charm. Although greedy and politic, Godwine was, so long as his power lasted, a strong check on the foreigners. However, he and his whole family were forced to flee the country and outlawed, in 1051, because he resisted the King's orders to punish the men of Dover who had been drawn into a conflict with the unruly followers of Edward's brother-in-law, the Count of Boulogne, who had been the guest of the King.

Visit of William of Normandy. — During their enforced exile Edward is said to have received a visit from a very notable man, no less a person than William, Duke of Normandy and future conqueror of England. He was a descendant of Rollo the Northman, who had conquered the district about the mouth of the Seine early in the tenth century. The line founded by this old Norse viking had, in the course of time, become ducal vassals of the newly established kingdom of the French, and the Norsemen, while retaining the fierceness and warlike prowess of their race, had adopted French manners and customs and French methods of government. In 1035, when William was barely eight years old, his father, Robert the Magnificent, had died on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem. William was an illegitimate son by a mother of very humble birth, the daughter of a tanner of Falaise. Nevertheless he had, by hard fighting, secured the Dukedom, and,

still a young man of twenty-four, was the most powerful lord among the French. William's visit to England was so well timed that there seems to be no doubt that he undertook it on a chance of being made the heir of the childless Edward. Godwine and his family, the champions of the English party, were in exile and Norman influence was supreme at the court. William afterwards asserted that Edward promised him the succession. Very likely this was true. But Edward had no right to make any such promise which had no binding value; for it was the custom of the English Witan to choose their own King from the members of the royal family.

Reaction Against the Normans. — Soon after William's alleged visit, a revulsion of popular feeling against Edward's favor to the Normans encouraged Godwine to return. The unpopular Normans fled and outlawry was declared against those who "reared up bad law . . . and brought evil councils into the land." Robert of Jumiéges was replaced as Archbishop of Canterbury by Stigand, an Englishman. The Pope, however, was not consulted, and his decision that the proceeding was unlawful gave William a second pretext for his later invasion of England. Godwine died in 1053, whereupon the Earldom of Wessex fell to Godwine's son Harold, a brave and earnest man, conscientious and gracious, but evidently inferior in ability to his father. In 1055, on the death of the Earl of Northumbria, Waltheof, the heir was passed over and Harold's brother Tostig was appointed to succeed him. When another brother got East Anglia, which Harold had once held, and other territories as well, all of England, except Mercia, was in the control of Godwine's sons. In such a situation it was quite natural that Harold should aspire to the throne, even though he was in no way related to the royal family except as brother to the Queen. To be sure, Edward the Ætheling, son of Edmund Ironside, had returned home in 1057, but he died almost immediately, and his son Eadgar and his daughter Margaret were mere children. By 1064 Harold was generally regarded as heir to the throne.

Death of Edward the Confessor. — About this time a curious incident happened which gave William his third pretext for claiming the crown. Sometime between the autumn of 1064 and the spring of 1065, Harold, while on a ship, was blown by contrary winds to the coast of Ponthieu, and seized by the reigning Count. When the news reached William he demanded that Harold be handed over to him, and forced him to swear to support his succession to the throne. Not very long after Harold's return to England the Northumbrians rose against Tostig, threw off his rule, and chose in his place, Morkere, the brother of Edwin, Earl of Mercia. Much to Tostig's disgust Harold

yielded to the popular will. In the midst of this confusion, Edward passed away, 5 January, 1066, uttering gloomy prophecies in his declining days. Recognizing the inevitable, however, he commended the kingdom to Harold on the eve of his death.

Harold, King (1066). — There were three candidates for the throne, little Eadgar the Ætheling, Duke William, and Harold. Even the sticklers for the old line saw that they stood the best chance of preserving English independence by supporting Harold. So he was hastily elected by such of the Witan as were in London on the very day of Edward's funeral, 6 January. Popular as he was with the people, the new King "had little stillness the while that he ruled." His enemies were many. There were Edwin and Morkere hostile to the house of Godwine; there was his own brother Tostig, lurking abroad, burning to recover his northern earldom and to revenge himself on all who had shared in putting him out, and there was the Pope, ready to aid whoever would expel the usurper Stigand. Finally, there was William, alert, resolute, and determined to secure the coveted crown. His claims and pretexts, as we know, were many, the promise of Edward, the oath of Harold, and the championship of the Church; indeed, he advanced a further claim in behalf of his wife, Matilda, descended from the old Anglo-Saxon line of kings. When Harold refused to listen to him he at once prepared for war, sought to attach the courts of Europe to his cause, and secured the papal blessing for his expedition. In the late summer of 1066 Tostig, accompanied by Harold Hardrada, King of Norway, and a great force invaded Yorkshire. Directly the news reached him, Harold hurried to the scene, met and annihilated the invading army, 25 September, 1066, at Stamford Bridge, eight miles northeast of York. Tostig and Harold Hardrada both fell on the field.

The Coming of William. His Victory at Hastings (1066). — Within ten days Harold was back in London; but already, six days before, William had landed at Pevensey on the south coast of England, with a following composed of members of young Norman nobility and by adventurers and soldiers of fortune from all over Europe.[1] From Pevensey he marched to Hastings, which commanded the northern road to London, where he awaited the coming of Harold, who hastened to meet him after taking less than a week to prepare his forces. At the news of Harold's approach William advanced to attack him. On the morning of 14 October the Anglo-Saxon King took a strong posi-

[1] According to tradition William stumbled and fell on the shingly beach as he landed. His followers regarded this as a bad omen; but he reassured them by crying out: "By the splendor of God, I have taken seizin of England."

tion on a little plateau — now covered by the site of Battle Abbey — lying north of Hastings and somewhat south and west of Senlac. He massed his men closely with their front line protected by locked shields,[1] and their formation extending along the front and two sides of the plateau, with the fourth side of the square open, protected by the steepness of the northern slope. In the center, at the highest point now marked by the high altar of the abbey church, stood Harold and his brothers. Here was planted the Dragon of Wessex and the King's own standard, an embroidered picture of a fighting man. William drew up his forces in three divisions, one of which attacked the English in front, while the two wings attacked their flanks.[2] Only after a series of fierce assaults were the Normans able to gain a foothold on the plateau, to break the shield wall, and to capture the standard beside which Harold fell, fighting to the last. His men made one final stand on a narrow isthmus protecting the rear of the plateau from which they had been driven. Here too they had to yield, and by sunset of the short October day William had won the victory which was to make him King of England.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

Ramsay, Oman, Hodgkin, and Taylor cited above. Also J. R. Green, *The Conquest of England* (1883); and E. A. Freeman, *Norman Conquest* (1875–1877), vols. I–III. Alfred Bowker, ed., *Alfred the Great* (1899) contains chapters on his life and times by various hands. The best biography of Alfred is a brief volume by Charles Plummer, *Life and Times of Alfred the Great* (1902). L. M. Larson, *Canute the Great* (1912), is particularly good for the Scandinavian background. J. H. Round, *Feudal England* (1895), pp. 332–398, sharply attacks Freeman's account of the Battle of Hastings.

For the history of the Church in this period, see Wakeman and Hunt.

[1] Another account not so generally accepted says that they stood behind a sort of wooden palisade which they had hastily erected.

[2] Of the Norman light-armed forces some were provided with cross-bows, a recently invented weapon, others were archers. The heavy-armed forces carried spears and long kite-shaped shields and were protected by helmets and by shirts and short breeches of ringed mail. The cavalry who fought, with heavy swords, were likewise protected by helmet and mail. The Anglo-Saxon light-armed forces bore javelins and stone hammers or axes for throwing. The heavy-armed had two-handed battle-axes. Among their other weapons were swords and daggers. The famous Bayeux Tapestry — a pictorial story of events from the time Harold was captured on the Norman coast till his death — is of great value on such points. It is embroidered on a strip of canvas nineteen inches wide and two hundred and thirty-one feet long. It was probably designed for the Bayeux Cathedral, but is now preserved in the Museum in the library.

CHAPTER V

THE STATE OF SOCIETY AT THE CLOSE OF THE ANGLO-SAXON PERIOD

Political Organization. — The Anglo-Saxon kingdom in its completed form consisted of several shires; each shire contained subordinate districts which came to be known as hundreds, and each hundred was made up of a number of small communities, either independent and self-governing, or subject to the control of a lord. If free, these latter were called townships; if under a lord they came, towards the close of this period, to be called manors.

The Township. — The kinsmen of each invading tribe settled down in a village surrounded by a rude form of boundary. These boundaries were called "tuns" (compare the German word *zaun*, meaning hedge) and the inclosed area was known as a tunscipe or township. Less frequently the village was known as a ham (from *heim*, the German word for home). Originally, most of these villages seem to have been free or independent. The settlement consisted of a line of houses along a street, the parent of the modern High Street, and each house was surrounded by a plot of ground which supplied garden produce. Stretching out beyond the village street were the lands used for tillage, of which every freeman was entitled to a certain amount, usually a "hide," supposed to contain about one hundred and twenty acres. The original allotments were scattered in strips in order that each might share in the good land and the bad land alike. Owing to lack of stock and farming implements each man helped his neighbors and was helped by them in turn. To avoid exhausting the soil, one part of the land was planted with wheat or rye, another with oats or barley, and a third would be allowed to lie fallow, and the crops were annually rotated. This was known as the three-field system. During the time from planting to harvest, rude temporary fences were constructed to keep out the cattle; after the crops were gathered, the fences were taken down and the cattle turned in to graze on the stubble. Besides the arable land there were common meadows and pasture

lands for the whole community, and woodlands as well. In the woods fuel was cut and swine roamed about, feeding on acorns and whatever else they could find. At stated seasons the qualified freemen assembled in their tun-moot, or town meeting; here officers were elected, chief among them the reeve, who presided over the affairs of the community and went with four chosen men to the meetings of the hundred and shire; at the tun-moot, also, by-laws were framed, rules of cultivation were settled, arrangements were made for looking after the roads and keeping the peace; but no judicial decisions were undertaken.

The Manor as an Agrarian and Judicial Unit. — As time went on most of these villages lost their independence and passed under the control of lords. The lord's steward or bailiff took the place of the elected reeve as president of the moot, and the freemen became dependent cultivators. Although landed estates with village communities in subjection upon them existed from the beginning of the period — old Roman villas under new lords — the numbers had greatly increased by the eleventh century when they came to be known as manors. They usually consisted of two parts. One was the demesne, or "inland," the land cultivated directly for the lord by slaves or by serfs, although it might be scattered among the other strips. The "outland" comprised the holdings of the serfs, usually limited to a yard or virgate (thirty acres or a quarter of a hide) although certain persons called "cotters" had no more than five acres. The serf received not only land from his lord, but also stock, cattle, and farming implements, and some household furniture. In return, he paid part of his produce in rent, and was called upon to labor during some days in the week and at intervals during harvest and to plow in the lord's lands. On the eve of the Conquest the lords had come to administer justice on their estates, and the old township courts became judicial as well as administrative bodies under the lord's steward or bailiff.

Boroughs and Cities. — Another growth of this period is the borough and city. Usually in England the word "town" is synonymous with borough and is to be distinguished from a township or village. The former had a larger population and enjoyed peculiar organization and privileges. The most characteristic feature was the wall,[1] then they usually had a court of their own and a market. The origin of most of these boroughs is shrouded in obscurity. Some have tried to trace them from the Roman municipalities, but without success. The Roman towns were centers of a highly developed urban life, while the medieval towns were frequently little more than agricultural and fishing centers; indeed, the burghers often had farms outside the

[1] Hence the name *burh*, a fortification.

walls. While the sites were sometimes determined by the older Roman settlements, these boroughs seem usually to have originated from fortified places in the wars against the Danes during the ninth and tenth centuries. Sometimes, however, a town grew from the union of many neighboring townships, or developed from a settlement around a monastery or a castle, or where a crossing of roads or the ford of a river provided a favorable site for a market. Gradually these towns acquired charters confirming old privileges or granting new ones. A city is merely a borough where a cathedral is situated.[1]

The Hundred. — Until the courts of the boroughs and manors came into being, the hundred was the center for all judicial purposes. The hundreds seem to have been originally districts of the tribal kingdoms, allotted to a hundred warriors or a hundred heads of families. Each had an assembly which met once a month. It was the duty of the presiding man, the reeve or elder, to collect the dues from the hundred and to keep order; his judicial position was not the same as that of our modern judge, for he merely acted as the mouthpiece of men qualified to attend the court — the priest, reeve, and four men from each township or manor as well as all free landowners and the nobles or thegns of the hundred. The jurisdiction exercised was criminal as well as civil. In the beginning, we find the groups of kinsmen responsible for the conduct of their members; in cases of murder or serious injury they had the privilege of waging, or the obligation of submitting to the feud or private warfare. But, before the end of the period, the community had established its position as arbiter, and an elaborate compensation had been arranged — "wergeld" for murder or injury, and "bot" for other damages. It was only when such satisfaction was refused that the kindred had a right to wage war or seize the possessions of the one who was at fault. For its share in securing justice the State came to claim a fine, known as a "wite," from the offender.

Procedure in the Hundred Moot. — Procedure was as follows. The offended party made a formal demand before the public meeting or the presiding officer. The accused was obliged, under penalty, to answer the charge and had to deposit a pledge to abide by the decision of the court. If he admitted his guilt, it was the duty of the meeting to determine the penalty. If he wished to contest the accusation, he denied it with a formal oath, usually supported by a number of oath helpers, varying according to his rank or to the gravity of offense. Sometimes, in cases where land or cattle were involved, documents

[1] Recently, however, some large boroughs where there are no cathedrals, have been given the honorary title of cities.

might be produced or witnesses to answer set questions. When the crime was too serious, or the accused was too notorious to find oath helpers, or when he was a foreigner, he had to proceed to the ordeal; that is, submit his case to the judgment of God. In the fire ordeal the accused had to carry a piece of red-hot iron weighing one pound a distance of nine feet; his hand was then bandaged, and if it healed in three days he was declared innocent. For especially grave cases there was the threefold ordeal, when the iron weighed three pounds. Another form of test was the hot water ordeal, where the accused had to plunge his arm up to the wrist in boiling water and remove a stone; here, too, there was a threefold ordeal, where he had to plunge his arm in up to the elbow. The cold water ordeal is little heard of in Anglo-Saxon times, though it was much used later for trying witches. For this test the accused was bound and lowered into the water by a rope round his waist; if he sank a certain depth, he was innocent, if he floated, he was guilty. The corsned or sacred morsel was the form usually applied in the case of a priest; the person to be tried was given an ounce of consecrated cheese or bread to swallow — his guilt or innocence depending upon his ability to perform the feat. Since the people regarded the decision in each case as given by God, it partook of a religious ceremony; for which the accused prepared himself by a three days' fast and by taking the sacrament. If the test failed, the assembled multitude declared the penalty — fine, slavery, outlawry, or death. Imprisonment was not used as a form of punishment.

The Folkmoot and the Shire. — Before the union of the tribes the highest form of political and judicial organization was the folkmoot. At this assembly the great landowners, the freemen, and the priest, reeve, and four men met twice a year under their Ealdorman or chief. After the tribal states had been united into kingdoms, districts began to appear midway between the hundred or smaller jurisdiction and the kingdom. These came to be called shires, and originated at different times in different parts of the country. In the south, the kingdom of Wessex was divided probably on the lines of the ancient tribal states, and after the smaller kingdoms, Kent, Essex, and Sussex, were incorporated, they too were reduced to shires. North of the Thames the two kingdoms of East Anglia, Norfolk and Suffolk, were treated in the same way. The remainder of the midlands were artificially divided after the country had been won back from the Danes. Usually an important town or fortification was selected and the shire grouped around it; for example, Leicester formed the nucleus of Leicestershire. The shires in the extreme north — Lancashire, Cumberland, Westmoreland, Northumberland — were organized after the close of the

Anglo-Saxon period. Besides transacting judicial business the shire moot collected revenues and raised military levies. At first, each shire was under the control of an Ealdorman, or Earl, chosen by the King with the consent of his Wisemen. As time went on, the shire moot came to be presided over by a shire reeve or sheriff, who levied the military forces as well. Originally, the sheriff was the king's bailiff or steward employed to collect the rents of his estates in the shire, and he continued to be appointed and dismissed by the King at pleasure. The Bishops represented the Church; and since they were the only learned men of the time, they were of great assistance, participating in all business except trials where a death penalty was involved.

The Witenagemot. — The highest body in the land was the Witenagemot or moot of the Witan or Wisemen — the great officials whom the King assembled about him, — the Ealdormen, the Bishops, and the thegns or nobles. Their business was to assist and advise the King in devising such rude legal measures as were framed, to give their consent to land grants, and to the naming of Ealdormen and Bishops; moreover it was the Witan who named the Kings — though they were limited in their choice to the ablest male next in descent in the royal family — and on rare occasions they even deposed an unworthy ruler.

The King. — The King presided over the Witan and over the assemblies or synods of the Church. He led the levy, or fyrd, in war; he enforced the public peace, and he carried out the decrees which he made with the consent of his Witan. Bound to a considerable extent by the recorded laws and the traditional customs of the people, and, to some degree, limited by the Witan, the Anglo-Saxon Kings, in general, enjoyed large powers without being absolute monarchs.

Revenues in Anglo-Saxon Times. — In those simple days the expenses and income of the State were small and irregular, the latter chiefly paid in produce and personal services. The King and his officials had a right to maintenance for themselves and their retainers on their progress through the country, and goods could be seized for the royal needs. This right, known as *feorum fultum*, corresponded to the later purveyance. The most common form of public service was the *trinoda necessitas*, or threefold obligation of serving in the army, of repairing roads and bridges, and guarding fortresses. The King had rents and other dues from towns on the royal demesne, he received certain court fees and fines, and forfeitures of landed estates in case of lords who died without heirs or were guilty of grave offenses against his authority; he was also entitled to harbor dues and

tolls on trade, to wreckage and treasure trove. The Danegeld has already been described.

Ranks in Anglo-Saxon Society. — The question of ranks in Anglo-Saxon society is obscure and complicated. One thing is certain, that there were only a few of the very highest class — at the time of Edward the Confessor's death the Witan apparently consisted of less than sixty men. Next to the King, the Earl was the highest in rank; while he was the lineal descendant of the ancient Ealdorman, he had come to rule over not one, but many shires. Next to the Earl was the thegn, who, originally a minister or servant in the household of a King or great lord, had received endowments of land and had risen to the dignity of a territorial noble himself. Thegnhood was open not only to this ministerial class, but even to a merchant, if he "throve so that he fared thrice over the wide sea by his own means." The ceorls, or simple freemen, who stood on the next lower rung in the social ladder, were a comparatively small class. They paid fixed rents and services for the lands which otherwise were theirs even to hand down to their heirs; they served in the fyrd, and had a right to attend the various courts where justice was administered and business transacted. Below the ceorls were various classes of servile dependents, personally free, but debarred from political rights, generally bound to the estate of some lord by services — usually onerous and uncertain — for the lands that they held.

The Rise and Decline of the Royal Power. — Many evidences of the growth of the royal power to the end of the tenth century can be traced; for example, from the time of Alfred, plotting against the King's life became a capital offense. Then the "King's Peace," at one time limited to special places and seasons — to certain Roman roads, to navigable rivers, and to Christmas and Easter — was extended over the whole country throughout the year. But as the Kingdom grew in size, the royal power, for reasons already stated, declined in strength, while the manors, the borough courts, and the jurisdictions of the territorial magnates came to be the real centers of power. Thus at the eve of the Conquest there were in conflict two opposing tendencies. On the military side, there were two armies, the shire levies under the King's representative, the sheriff, and the armies of the Earls and thegns, nominally the King's, but which could be used for private purposes; on the judicial side, there were the popular courts of the hundred and shire, constantly encroached on by those of the borough and manor. While the Anglo-Saxons had contributed to those who came after, principles and methods of local self-government, they had failed to furnish the necessary complement, a strong central government without which local freedom could easily

degenerate into anarchy. It was reserved for their conquerors to supply what was lacking.

Anglo-Saxon Literature. — The earliest literature among the Anglo-Saxons reflects the characteristics of the race and is profoundly influenced by their surroundings. It is marked by love of the sea, a sense of gloom and mystery, by the fierceness and boastfulness of the primitive man, tempered and ennobled by courage and generosity. Their greatest achievements were in the form of the epic, where an action is narrated in poetic form, and sung by glee men in halls of thegns. Of these, *Beowulf* is the earliest and the only one which has survived in anything like completeness. The material — brought by the later Angles from their Continental homes but only worked up into enduring shape in the eighth century — recounts the glorious deeds of the Scandinavian hero Beowulf, his slaying of Grendel, the marsh fiend, and his mother, the "she-wolf of the abyss," and of the fire-vomiting dragon. Beside the epics there are some lyrics, or poems, that deal with sentiments and feelings, softened by a melancholy which some have supposed due to Celtic or Christian influence.

Contrasted with this poetry is that which owes its inspiration to the Church and the Scriptures. One of the most beautiful stories in Bede is that of Cædmon, a rude, unlearned cowherd attached to the monastery of Whitby. He had no gift of song, and often at the merry-makings of his companions, when the harp was passed to him, he would leave the table and return to his stable. On one such occasion a figure appeared to him in his sleep and bade him sing; at first he said he could not, but, finally, at the bidding of the stranger he began to sing verses in the praise of God. The next morning he rose and told his dream to the steward of the abbey, who took him before the abbess and divers learned men. After repeating his story they explained to him a passage of the Bible which he rendered into wonderful verse. He was made a brother of the monastery, and, as Bede tells us, "he sang the creation of the world, the origin of man, and all the history of Genesis: and made many verses on the departure of the children of Israel and their entering into the land of promise, with many other histories from Holy Writ." Another early Anglo-Saxon poet was Cynewulf. According to writings attributed to him, he was a wandering Northumbrian minstrel of the eighth century, who in his youth rejoiced in hunting, the bow, and the horse, who received many golden gifts for singing in the halls of the great. Turning in his old age to graver things, he wrote four poems on the lives of Christ and the Saints, and very possibly was the author of *Riddles*, and of the *Phœnix*, an allegory. Next to Bede the greatest prose work of the

period is the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. From King Alfred's time it was continued independently by at least half a dozen religious houses, one version reaching to 1154, and its simple but quaint and graphic entries furnish the chief source of information for much of the period.

Art and Building. — The Anglo-Saxons were notable for their skill in illuminating manuscripts and in embroidery and weaving — we hear how the shuttle "filled not only with purple but with all other colors, flies now this way, now that, among the close spread threads," and how they "glorified the wool work with groups of pictures." Apparently they were unversed in the mason's art, for they seem to have built with wood. Except perhaps in the north no stone churches were constructed until Edward the Confessor, when, under Norman influence, those grand and stately edifices begin to appear which fill us with awe and reverence even to this present day. Westminster Abbey, though built on an earlier site, was Edward's peculiar creation. The simpler sort of houses consisted of a single room and were surrounded by a hedge. Sometimes they had an upper chamber, called a "solarium," though this was not common. The homes of the greater folk consisted of a hall surrounded by separate buildings which were used for bed-chambers, or "bowers," as they were called, for household officers, and for the housing of cattle. The more pretentious were roofed with tiles, and, inclosing the whole, was a wall usually of earth. The walls of the hall were usually covered with tapestry, and harps, armor, and weapons were hung about on pegs. The fire was in the middle of the floor and the smoke escaped through an opening in the roof. Benches, sometimes covered with carpets and cushions, constituted the chief furniture. At one end of the hall was a raised platform where those of higher rank sat. Chairs were few and were generally the seats of Kings and great persons; beds were usually mere sacks of straw laid on branches, and were often built in recesses and covered with a curtain. Since there was no sitting room but the hall, the chamber where the women sat, after they had served the cup to the lord's guests, was the bedroom. Here they spun and wove, here they sewed and embroidered.

Manner of Living. — At a time when there was little to read and when means of communication were few and inadequate, the pleasures of feast and song bulked large. Bread was a great staple, and among their other articles of food were milk, butter, cheese, fish, poultry, and meat. Vegetables, on the other hand, were few, and in the winter there were none. For months in the year salt meat was the only kind to be had, since cattle could not be kept over the winter. Table manners were as yet very primitive, for there were no forks and few

table knives; after dinner the hands were washed, the tables, mere temporary affairs, were taken away, and drinking began. Ale, mead, or wine were passed about while the company listened to story-telling or music or danced. The common musical instruments were the harp (poetically known as the glee-wood), the cithern, the pipe, and the horn. Feasts often ended in quarrels. Games of chance were another source of diversion. Though singing and playing were regarded as desirable accomplishments, wandering glee men did not enjoy a very high status, and besides singing and playing performed tricks and cracked jokes from hall to village. The villagers were sometimes regaled with exhibitions of dancing bears and on holidays made merry with games such as running, leaping, and wrestling. Hunting and hawking were favorite pastimes even with the clergy and with Kings like Alfred and Edward the Confessor. Owing to the badness of the roads people went about mostly on horseback, though carts or chariots, usually two-wheeled, were sometimes used for traveling. Inns were so infrequent that halls and monasteries entertained freely and hospitality was enjoined even by ecclesiastical laws. Merchants, however, usually traveled in companies, and carried tents under which they stopped at night. Ale houses, on the other hand, which received no lodgers, were overcommon and were much sought by the humbler folk, who had little else to do during the long dark days.

Public Health. — Plague, pestilence, and famine were dread visitants of early and medieval England, though not as frequent or destructive as on the Continent. Epidemics entered the land from time to time from the east, like the yellow plague which appeared in south England, in 664, and spread north. It later reappeared and so thinned the monks of Jarrow that the little boy Bede was the only one left to join the Abbot in the responses. Local epidemics — usually fevers due to famines from failure of crops and cattle — were more frequent and less destructive.

Trade. — The early villages and manors were almost altogether self-sufficing, raising their own food and making their own clothes. At first there was little buying or selling; each man worked for the other members of the community and was supplied by them in turn. The trade which gradually developed was at first largely domestic. Most little towns had a market, and, before the close of the period, fairs were coming to assume a position of importance. For some time after the coming of the Teutons, seafaring life ceased and there was in consequence little oversea trade. Although English merchants visited the Frankish Empire, in the time of Offa, it was the Danish invasions which first revived the art of ship-building. Alfred, says the *Chroni-*

cle for 897, "commanded long ships to be built to oppose the invaders." These ships were primarily for defense; but their construction stimulated the growth of trading vessels.[1] In Alfred's time the chief intercourse was with France and the Mediterranean, though the coming of the Danes opened communications with the trading settlements of the Northmen. Scattered indications occur from time to time of the growth of an import and export trade. By the close of the tenth and early part of the eleventh century, wine, fish, clothes, pepper, gloves, and glass were brought from France, Flanders, and the Empire. From the north and northeast came furs, skins, ropes, masts, weapons, and iron work. Many other commodities, such as brocades, silk, precious gems, gold, ointments, and ivory came from the Orient, whence they were conveyed overland to the Bosphorus, and shipped from there to Venice or some other Italian port. Thence they were taken overland to Flanders to be finally shipped across the Channel. In return the English exported mainly metals — such as tin and lead — wool, and slaves. The slave trade was carried on extensively in spite of the efforts of the Church to stop it, and it was near the close of the twelfth century before the iniquitous traffic was stamped out.

Such was England on the eve of the Conquest. William who now entered as master was to inflict much misery; but he was to contribute much to its power and prosperity.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

Political and legal institutions are treated in Taylor, Taswell-Langmead, and A. B. White. Pollock and Maitland's *English Law* (2 vols., 1898) is the authoritative work on the period up to Edward I. Traill's *Social England*, I, deals with all aspects of Anglo-Saxon history and life; Ramsay treats briefly the same subject. W. J. Ashley, *English Economic History* (1892) I; Wm. Cunningham, *Growth of English Industry and Commerce* (5th ed. 1912); and E. Lipson, *An Introduction to the Economic History of England* (1915) I, are devoted mainly to economic conditions, while more compendious accounts are F. W. Tickner, *A Social and Industrial History of England* (1916) and A. P. Usher, *An Introduction to the Industrial History of England* (1920), the latter of which is the more serious and scholarly. The daily life of the Anglo-Saxons is described in Thomas Wright's *Homes of Other Days* (1871).

For a brief account of Anglo-Saxon literature see Moody and Lovett, *A History of English Literature* (1908), perhaps the best one-volume work covering the whole period of English literature. H. A. Taine, *History of English Literature* (tr. van Laun, 4 vols., 1873) is very stimulating; but not

[1] Indeed, England never had a permanent navy till the sixteenth century.

always to be relied upon. J. A. Jusserand, *A Literary History of the English People* (3 vols., 1906–1909) is a charming and scholarly treatment. *The Cambridge History of Literature* (vols. I–X, 1907–1913) is a coöperative work which contains a mine of information. Further references may be found in Moody and Lovett's reading guide, 385 ff.

For selections from the Anglo-Saxon laws, chiefly in English translation, see Stubbs, *Select Charters Illustrative of English Constitutional History* (7th ed., 1890), pp. 60–76.

CHAPTER VI

THE ANGLO-NORMAN KINGS (1066–1154). THE STRENGTHENING OF THE CENTRAL POWER OF WILLIAM AND HIS SONS. THE INTERVAL OF ANARCHY IN THE REIGN OF STEPHEN

William Secures London and is Crowned King of England. — After his victory at Hastings many weeks passed before William reached London. Those who held the City had elected Eadgar the Ætheling to succeed Harold; but on William's approach they gave up all hope of resistance, went forth to meet him, and offered to take him for their King. The Conqueror was crowned on Christmas Day, 1066, in Edward's Abbey.

William Redistributes the Lands of the Conquered. — Before proceeding to extend his conquests, William took steps to organize what he already held. Courts were set up, a charter confirming ancient liberties was granted to the men of London, friends and supporters were rewarded, and foes punished. The lands of those who had fought against the Conqueror were seized and divided among himself and his followers, while those who submitted were allowed to keep their lands, but only on payment of heavy fines. Henceforth, there were to be no lands held in absolute ownership; every landlord must hold directly or indirectly of the King.

William Establishes His Power, Puts Down Risings (1067–1075). — For the next four or five years after his accession, the Norman Conqueror was occupied in putting down risings and overcoming resistance to the extension of his authority. The North gave the most serious trouble, which began in 1068 and came to a head in a great rising in the following year. Eadgar the Ætheling, who had taken refuge in Scotland, was set up as King, and a body of Danes assisted the native English and Scots. When William was at length able to prevail over his enemies, he took care to stamp out all possibility of further resistance. Marching from the Ouse to the Tyne and back, he ruthlessly destroyed everything that lived or could sustain life, and every building, so that the vale of York was a waste and ruin

for years to come. From York he led his army across to Chester in the dead of winter. His pitiless devastation remains an indelible blot on his character; but neither he nor his sons had to face another general rising of the English. A few of the more desperate, led by one Hereward the Wake,[1] made a final stand in the island of Ely in 1071, where the dying resistance of the native English breathed its last gasp. William's future difficulties came from his own following. Most formidable, though he succeeded in suppressing it, was a rising attempted in 1075 by two of his Earls. Their pretext was that he was an usurper, their real grievance that he held them under too strict control.

William's Method of Maintaining His Hold over the English. — Once his arms had triumphed, William had to solve the twofold problem of holding the English in subjection and of keeping a check on his Norman followers. In the case of the English, he continued the practice of seizing the lands of those who resisted his authority and handing them over to Norman lords, each of whom had to furnish a contingent of soldiers in proportion to the size of his grant. Secondly, he secured every district which he conquered by a castle garrisoned with his own men. Moreover, instead of relying on force alone, he attached the English to himself by protecting them with good laws, and gradually they came to see that even stern rule and oppressive taxes accompanied by peace and prosperity were better than anarchy.

Checks on the Baronage. — The baronage were held in check partly by force of circumstances, partly by William's courage, energy, and wise foresight. Though he granted enormous estates to some, the lands composing them were scattered throughout the land; yet this was due to accident rather than to design — to the piecemeal character of the conquest and to the fact that they had been so held under their former owners. Intentionally, however, he broke up the four great earldoms which had been such a source of weakness to the Kings of the later Anglo-Saxon period. If he granted broad lands and quasi-regal or palatine rights to certain trusted officials such as the Earl of Chester, and the Bishop of Durham, this was for the defense of his borders. In general, it was his aim to keep the administration in the hands of the sheriff and to reduce the Earls to a merely titular position. By retaining control over the local machinery and also by keeping up the national militia, he held a strong counterpoise to baronial power.

William and the Church. — Likewise, William attached to himself the Churchmen, and, so far as possible, he sought to detach them

[1] Hero of a famous novel by Charles Kingsley.

from secular interests. He took control of the appointment of great prelates, and he issued an ordinance providing that henceforth ecclesiastical persons and causes should not be tried in the secular courts, but in those of the Bishop. Thus, he hoped to free the clergy from the control of those whose lives they were seeking to reform and save, and, by drawing them away from the laity, to bind them more closely to him as King; but the result, in the long run, was unfortunate, for it tended to foster an exclusive privileged class, and opened a quarrel between two conflicting jurisdictions which lasted for centuries.

Clerical Appointments and Relations with the Papacy. — For his episcopal appointments William almost invariably chose Normans. As Archbishop of Canterbury he selected Lanfranc, a sagacious and learned Italian who had migrated to Normandy. While William favored his Norman supporters, his motives were by no means wholly political. The Anglo-Saxon Church had not kept pace with those of the Continent in learning, and was low in morals as well; so, aided by the advice of his councilors, William worked sincerely, if not always successfully, to secure Bishops and Abbots who would strive for better things. Monasteries once more became the centers of learning and culture, and many new churches and abbeys were built in the Norman style of architecture. While William desired to be the Pope's champion and friend, he was prepared to resist to the utmost any papal encroachment on his authority or independence. Accordingly, he laid down three principles which defined the position of English sovereigns for some time to come: that no Pope should be recognized or no papal letters should be received without his permission; no decrees of ecclesiastical assemblies should be passed without his consent; and no tenant-in-chief of the Crown should be excommunicated without his orders.

Retention of the Old Anglo-Saxon Laws. — In fact a conqueror, William constantly asserted that he was the legitimate successor of Edward the Confessor, so, as far as possible, he allowed the English to retain their manners, customs, and institutions, and introduced but few innovations. He did away with death penalties, though the mutilations he allowed in their stead must have been far more cruel. A new form of ordeal, the judicial combat, he introduced mainly for the benefit of his Normans. A curious device for their protection, later used as a means of royal extortion, was the responsibility of the hundred or presentment of Englishry, which provided that if a man were murdered, the hundred where it happened had to pay a heavy fine, unless they could find the assassin or prove that the victim was an Englishman. William's forest regulations were also an innovation.

While he and his sons, passionately fond of hunting, reserved large tracts of land for their pastime,[1] there were many considerations beside mere love of sport that made him and his successors cling so tenaciously to their forest rights. They yielded the Crown a revenue — for rights of cutting wood and pasturing, chiefly of swine, were sold — they furnished an excuse for keeping a large force of armed men which could be used for a royal army in time of need; finally, they offered a pretext for setting up arbitrary courts. William's penalty for hunting the royal deer was loss of eyes.

The Domesday Survey (1085). — In order to estimate the resources of the country for purposes of taxation, we find William having "much thought and deep speech" with his Witan at Gloucester, in 1085, over the state of the country and its population. In consequence, he determined on a great survey or official inquiry known as the Domesday Survey.[2] The work was done by royal commissioners who went through the shires and hundreds and took testimony on oath from those best qualified to give it — the land-owners, the priests, the bailiffs, and six villeins from each township or manor — as to what property the inhabitants possessed in land and cattle and how much it was worth. The results were recorded in the Domesday Book, which gave "a great rate book or tax roll, a land register, . . . a census of population, and topographical dictionary" not only to the King, but to posterity as well.

The Oath on Salisbury Plain (1086). — In the following year William held a great Gemot on Salisbury plain. We are told that "there came to him his Witan and all the landsittende (land owning) men of substance that were all over England, whosoever men they were, and all bowed down to him, and became his men, and swore oaths of fealty to him that they would be faithful to him against all men." Much has been made of this Salisbury Oath binding all the land-owners of England directly to the King as against all other lords; but it represents no new departure; for doubtless such oaths had been exacted, probably in the local courts, since the beginning of the reign. Moreover, it is most unlikely that all of the landowners of England could have been assembled at one time in one place.

Last Years and Death (1087). — Of William's last years little remains to be said. He had to face revolts from Robert, his eldest son, who, discontented because his father denied him power corresponding to his station and expectations, was egged on by many unruly nobles

[1] These lands were usually, though not necessarily, wooded, but any tract of Crown land reserved for royal hunting was called a forest.

[2] Probably so called, because, like the Day of Judgment, it would spare none.

hoping to profit by discord, and by the King of France, always looking for a chance to extend his territories. After two or three years of desultory fighting, father and son were reconciled, but Robert was always ready when occasion offered to cause his father trouble. William, before his death, divided his kingdom, assigning Normandy to his eldest son Robert, and England to William Rufus, while to Henry he gave 5000 pounds of silver with the prophecy, it is said, that in due time he would get all his father had.

Character and Rule. — William the Conqueror was a man to inspire awe. Harsh, despotic, and avaricious, he burdened his subjects with heavy exactions; yet, withal, he was "a very wise and a great man," and more honored and more powerful than any of his predecessors, "mild to those good men who loved God, but severe beyond measure to those who withstood his will." Altogether, his rule was good for England, for he put an end to those disruptive tendencies which stood in the way of national organization, and laid the foundation of strong, orderly government which is the necessary basis of freedom, prosperity, and progress.

Results of the Norman Conquest. — The Norman Conquest was deep and far-reaching in its results. In the first place, it brought in a new line of foreign kings who were, for three successive reigns, men of vigor and energy and who were supported by an armed force bound to them by close and special ties. Thus fortified they not only crushed out the local differences which had marked the earlier period, but, by preserving whatever was best in the old system, they paved the way for the combination of central unity and local independence which survives to-day as the most chracteristic feature of the English government. Although their aim was primarily to strengthen their own position, the peace and order which they preserved made for progress. Moreover, the infusion of a new racial element, combining the vigor of the primitive Northmen and the alertness of the Latinized Frenchmen, tended to vivify and broaden the sluggish and narrow national character. Finally, by bringing remote England into closer connection with the Continent, the Conquest opened the way for the intellectual and cultivating influences of the centers of older and higher civilization.

Anglo-Norman Feudalism. — Doubtless the most significant change of all was the introduction of a well-organized form of feudal tenure, where feudal tendencies only had hitherto existed. Feudalism is a greatly overworked word used to describe conditions, by no means identical, which prevailed in England, France, and Germany from the eighth to the fifteenth centuries. In general "Feudalism com-

prises both a system of land tenure and a system of government," an arrangement by which the various relations between man and man were determined by the amount of land held by one of another. At the top of the scale stood the lord or suzereign in whom the title or ownership of the land was vested. Those to whom he gave the use of it were called vassals; lord and vassal were each bound by specified obligations, the lord to protect and defend his vassal, the vassal to render service to his lord. The commonest form of service rendered was military, and usually there were several intermediate lords and vassals between the suzerain and the small cultivator. In a thoroughly feudalized State the King was at the top of the scale; as a matter of fact, however, the greater lords held themselves independent of their nominal ruler and led their own army and judged and taxed their own dependents. The feudal elements had existed in Anglo-Saxon England, thegns or manorial lords were granted lands in return for service and exercised jurisdiction over their dependents, but their relation to the Crown was not feudal, for their ownership was absolute; although they furnished armies for their King, they did not do so by virtue of any contract or agreement based on their land grant. What William did was to fuse these elements into a single whole. He made himself the supreme landowner of every foot of English soil; every new grant was made conditional on service rendered, and every Englishman whom he allowed to remain in possession had to yield his title to the King and promise service likewise. Generally grants were made in return for an agreement on the part of the landlord to furnish the King with a specified number of fully armed knights to serve him in his foreign campaigns for a stated period each year — usually forty days.[1]

Feudal Incidents and Other Obligations. — Certain obligations came to attach to all military tenures. The overlord had the right, known as wardship, of acting as guardian, and of collecting the revenues of the estate during the time when the heir was under age. When the young lord entered into possession he had to pay a fine known as relief. By the right of marriage, so called, the lord could determine when an heiress might marry and demand payment to allow her to take a husband of her own choice. By escheat and forfeiture the lord could recover the estate in case of failure of heirs, or for offenses against feudal law by the vassal. These obligations at-

[1] The unit of service was called a knight's fee. It was usually five hides in extent but might be larger or smaller, depending on the value of the land. In later times the knight's fee was estimated on the basis of its annual income, first £20 and then £40.

tached to a military tenure were called incidents. Besides the incidents there were certain payments, known as aids, which the lord could claim at crises. Three of these became customary, one on knighting the King's son, another on his eldest daughter's marriage, and a third to ransom him in case he fell into captivity.[1] William, in carefully avoiding the evils of Continental feudalism, where the landlords were virtually independent rulers, was aided by the small size of the Island and the fact that every part was comparatively accessible from the center. By establishing feudalism as a form of land tenure and preventing it from becoming a system of government, he made it a source of strength rather than weakness; for he was supreme landowner as well as King, and got thereby much revenue[2] and an additional army.

Magnum Concilium. — The old National Assembly continued to meet, usually three times a year, on Easter at Winchester, Whitsuntide at Westminster, and Christmas at Gloucester. Now, however, it was called the Great Council (*Magnum Concilium*) or King's Court (*Curia Regia*); also where it formerly consisted of Englishmen, it now consisted largely of Normans; finally, the bishops and great landed nobles came, henceforth, not by virtue of their office, but as tenants-in-chief of the Crown. The Great Council dealt with judicial cases beyond the competence of the local and Church courts and with others where they failed to render justice. While the King professed to legislate and tax with the sanction of the Great Council, he was, like the stronger Anglo-Saxon monarchs, practically supreme.

The Manor as a Judicial and Agrarian Unit. — After the Conquest there was a steady increase in the jurisdiction of the lord of the manor, who was represented in his judicial and administrative business by his steward or bailiff, and often did not live continuously on any one of his estates. The tenants rendered their services of labor and paid rents chiefly in produce,[3] for little or no money was yet in local cir-

[1] Another result of feudalism was to develop a form of inheritance, known as primogeniture, by which the lands came to descend to the eldest son. The prevailing Anglo-Saxon custom of equal division among heirs, known as gavelkind, practically disappeared, except in Kent.

[2] Besides the feudal revenues, and the Danegeld, revived in 1084, William had rents from the royal manors, fees from the courts of the hundreds and shires, as well as from cases settled in the Great Council, and various miscellaneous receipts, such as murder fines from the hundreds.

[3] They were mostly of servile or villein states, for slavery did not long survive the Conquest. The influence of the Church must not be forgotten, particularly in improving the slave's lot and in doing away with traffic beyond the seas; but the gradual disappearance of slavery itself was largely due to the feudal theory, which had no place for any being absolutely without rights.

culation. Methods of agriculture remained primitive; the system of scattered holdings and common cultivation still prevailed, marling was the only way of fertilizing the soil, and there was much unclaimed or waste land. The chief crop was wheat, though the product of oats and barley was considerable; there were some vegetables, but no root crops. Orchards existed and at least a few vineyards, bees were raised to a considerable extent because the honey was used for sugar, and dairy produce and poultry formed staple articles of diet. The state of public health was probably better than on the Continent; there was some leprosy, though not as much as is sometimes supposed, while skin diseases were common from the absence of fresh vegetables and the excessive use of fish and meat.

Towns after the Conquest. — The great majority of the towns were agricultural, and the flourishing centers of trade as a rule were the seaports. From one point of view, the towns suffered, though temporarily, from the Conquest, because castles were established in their midst or rebuilt, the townsmen were burdened with garrisons, and often their houses were cleared away to make room for fortifications. Nevertheless, the ultimate result of the Conquest was favorable to town growth; foreign commerce was extended by closer relations with the Continent and internal trade was fostered by the better peace that the strong Kings of the Norman lines were able to impose.

The Population. — The population at the period of the Conquest was probably 300,000 families or 2,000,000 souls, of whom the great majority were serfs in varying degrees of dependence, and there were comparatively few freeholders or bondmen. Most of the tenants-in-chief and even the more considerable under-tenants were Frenchmen; but the two races soon fused by intermarriage, and the distinction between Englishmen and Frenchmen came to be the one between the King's subjects on either side of the Channel rather than one between Saxons and Normans settled in England.

Language and Literature. — French was chiefly spoken at the Royal Court, in the castle, and the manor house, while English was the tongue of the humbler folk. Laws, charters, records, and the writings of the learned were in Latin. The exclusion of the Anglo-Saxons from the higher offices checked the growth of a literature in the native tongue. Since the Normans were practical and serious rather than romantic, most of their writing in this period is either religious or historical, and a prevailing interest of the time is shown in the number of lives of saints which appeared. The historical writers were, in the main, mere annalists, copying their earlier matter from their predecessors, and chiefly valuable for their rather bald records of their own day.

One happy exception is William of Malmesbury, who was the first writer since Bede to organize his material and to discuss cause and effect. Geoffrey of Monmouth, a Welshman, collected old Celtic legends, and is the source of much medieval romance; from him the stories of Arthur and Merlin were handed down and to him we owe the plot of Shakespeare's *King Lear*.

Anglo-Norman Architecture. — The new architectural movement begun by Edward the Confessor received a marked impulse from the Conquest, and very generally the Normans started rebuilding the cathedrals and abbeys of the conquered Saxons. Both peoples employed the so-called Romanesque style, but while the older edifices were of wood, the new church buildings in most instances were of stone. Decidedly simple, austere, and impressive they were, with their low square towers and round arches supported by heavy piers and columns, though early in the twelfth century a new style was introduced, known as the Gothic or Early English, characterized chiefly by the pointed arch. Even more notable was the development of castle building. In place of the Anglo-Saxon strongholds, which were simple mounds of earth surrounded by a moat and a palisade, the Normans introduced the square rectangular keep, or tower, of stone. Gradually, as the art of the defense progressed, outer walls were added and were strengthened by gate towers, projecting galleries were built with openings in the floor to command the ditch which was dug as a further defense, while, within the inclosure, other towers were constructed to sweep the invaders by a cross fire. Siege engines were at first very primitive and ineffective, so the chief way to reduce a castle was by starvation. The earliest castles, during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, were fortresses rather than places of residence, and castle guard was an obligation due from lesser men to the barons and the King.

William Rufus (1087–1100). Character and Policy. — The new King, William II — known as Rufus, from his ruddy face — showed considerable abilities as a soldier, and in holding the people on his side; he could be generous, on occasion, and was not very cruel for the age in which he lived. On the other hand, he was capricious, and inordinately wasteful; and so great was his greediness in extorting money and supplies from his subjects that many fled to the woods when he drew near, to save what they could. Worst of all was the viciousness of his personal life and his blasphemy. Even the fashions indicate the departure from the simpler and soberer ideals of the past reign. The courtiers began to let their hair grow long, curled, and bound with ribbons; they wore garments like women; they affected a feminine

mincing gait, and adopted shoes with long curved points like rams' horns, or scorpions' tails; they passed their nights in "drinking and revelry"; and it was said of William that "he every morning got up a worse man than he lay down and every evening lay down a worse man than he got up," and that he "openly mocked at God and the saints."

Resistance of the Norman Barons. — The English seemed to have welcomed him at his accession; but the Norman lords who had estates on both sides of the water, preferring the rule of his weaker brother Robert, broke out in revolt early in 1088. William, partly by his energy, partly by the support of some of the barons in England, but chiefly with the aid of the lesser folk, to whom he promised "the best law that had ever been in this land," managed to overcome his enemies. Once triumphant he imitated the discretion of his father, welcomed the submission of his enemies and was particularly mild to those who might be dangerous. Already at his coronation he had sought popularity in another quarter by gifts to the Church and poor.

Ranulf Flambard. — When Lanfranc, who had a great influence over him, died in 1089, William's rule changed for the worse. He took as his chief adviser Ranulf, or Ralph, known as "Flambard," the "Fiery Torch that licked up everything." As Chief Minister he managed all the financial and judicial business of the realm, and his name is associated with systematically fleecing the estates of royal tenants. While he did not originate, he carried to greater lengths than ever before the exactions known as feudal incidents, requiring particularly exorbitant reliefs from incoming heirs. Moreover, he extended his extortions to the possessions of the Church, shamelessly selling offices and keeping bishoprics and abbacies vacant in order to collect the revenue for the King.

Anselm made Archbishop of Canterbury (1093). — In 1093, William, overtaken by a serious illness and momentarily repenting of his evil ways, agreed to choose a successor to Lanfranc as Archbishop of Canterbury. The man selected was Anselm — a good and an upright man, of great learning, so unwilling to accept that the pastoral staff was literally forced into his hands, and he was carried bodily into the chapel for consecration. Events proved that he had correctly foreseen inevitable conflicts from which his gentle nature shrank. He cherished the high ideal that Churchmen, who stood for moral and spiritual betterment, should be absolutely independent of unscrupulous laymen. On the other hand, while William opposed him on unworthy grounds, there was a sound principle underlying his opposition; namely, that, since the Church officials pos-

sessed vast property and extensive temporal powers and were subject to a foreign master, they must, in the interest of law, order, and national unity, be subject to State control. Finally, Anselm did agree to observe the laws and customs of the realm in so far as he could without prejudicing his allegiance to the Holy See, and got the grudging permission of his Sovereign to go to Rome. With a pilgrim's scrip and staff he left the country never to return until a new King was on the throne.

The First Crusade, 1096. — Meantime, a movement was on foot which relieved William of danger from his brother Robert during the remainder of his reign. Peter of Amiens and Urban II were preaching a crusade, the first of many, to recover the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem from the Turks who had taken the city in 1077. Among the nobles of western Europe who joined in this holy enterprise was Robert of Normandy. Mortgaging his duchy to his brother Rufus for 10,000 marks, he took with him many younger sons and allies, who from lack of estates were likely to foment discord, and left William free to pursue his plans fairly undisturbed. His last years were spent mainly in trying to extend his power in the Norman duchy which he was holding in pawn; but England, shocked by his wickedness and burdened by taxation, was growing weary of him. In August, 1100, he was shot by a favorite courtier, probably accidentally, while hunting in the New Forest. When it was found that he was really dead, the nobles of the hunting party fled to Winchester, each to look after his own interests, leaving the body to be brought to the city by the foresters.

Henry I (1100–1135). His Charter of Liberties. — Henry, the Conqueror's youngest son, was one of those who hastened to Winchester, where he managed to seize the keys of the royal hoard. In spite of the claims of his brother Robert, he was accepted by the leading men on the spot and was crowned soon after at Westminster. As a means of attaching his people to him, the new King issued a Charter of Liberties in which he promised to do away with the evil customs of his brother's reign. No profit was to be taken from vacant bishoprics and abbeys. Reliefs from lay barons were to be just and lawful and the King was to charge nothing for licenses to marry. Just fines were to be taken from offending tenants in place of the excessive exactions of the two Williams, and military tenants were to be freed from all payments and labor except armed service. The laws of Edward the Confessor, with the Conqueror's improvements, were to be retained, but the forests were to be kept as the old King had possessed them. Such was "the parent of all later charters," which, although its promises were often broken, marks the first check on

the absolutism founded by the Conqueror and carried to such a height by the Red King. As a further guarantee of his intention to undo the wrongs of his brother's reign, Henry recalled Anselm, filled vacant bishoprics and abbeys, and sent Flambard to the Tower. The year after his coronation Henry had to meet an invasion led by Robert who had, shortly before, returned from the Holy Land. Having made terms with him he proceeded to punish the Norman barons resident in England who had worked against him, and for "three and thirty years he ruled England in peace." But Normandy, ruled by the unstable Robert, formed a refuge for the disaffected who might at any time organize another invasion into England. Moreover, English subjects who had estates in Normandy were constantly exposed to attacks from Henry's enemies, and Robert was either unwilling or unable to protect them. So Henry finally led an expedition across the Channel in 1106, defeated his brother's Norman army at Tinchebrai, took Robert prisoner [1] and appropriated the Duchy, which remained an English possession for nearly a hundred years.

Compromise with Anselm (1107). — The next year, 1107, was marked by a final agreement on the matter of filling episcopal offices. There were several stages in the process, election, homage to the King for temporal possessions, investiture — the conferring of the ring and the staff, which were spiritual symbols of the bishop's marriage to the Church and his assumption of the pastoral office — consecration, and enthronization. Anselm, on his return, had refused to repeat the homage for the lands of Canterbury which he had rendered to Rufus, and he also refused to consecrate bishops who had received investiture in his absence. Henry firmly insisted on lay investiture; but at length the Pope suggested a compromise by which the King agreed to allow the ring and staff to be conferred by the Church, on condition that each candidate render homage for his land. The victory was really the King's; for, by refusing to receive homage, he might block any episcopal appointment that he chose. From this time, too, it came to be the custom for the clergy of each cathedral to elect its bishop, but, owing to the fact that elections had to take place in the royal chapel, the King really dictated the choice.

Henry's Last Years. His Character and Policy. — During the remainder of the reign, Henry's chief interest was centered in notable improvements and innovations in the machinery of government and in an attempt to settle the succession. In 1120 his son and heir was drowned, and the only heir left to him was his daughter Matilda.

[1] He was taken to England and held a prisoner till he died in Cardiff Castle in 1134.

Although a woman had never ruled the land, Henry made the barons swear to accept her as his successor, a proceeding which resulted in years of strife.

Henry I himself died in 1135. He was a man of scholarly tastes — from which he got his name Beauclerk — affable but cold and calculating, who realized fully that he must hold down the turbulent barons, keep on good terms with the Church, and attach the people to himself if he was to rule as a strong King. In the orderly system of judicial and financial administration which he developed he was actuated by thrift and a desire to increase his resources, but he laid the foundation on which the wisest of his successors built and which has contributed so much to the stability of the English nation. He imposed heavy taxes and caused the laws to be administered with ferocious rigor, yet he gradually won for himself the name of the "Lion of Justice."

Administrative Machinery. The Curia Regis and the Exchequer. — It was after Henry had got the baronage and Church in hand that he began to develop a system of transacting the business of government which did so much, not only to increase the wealth and power of the Crown but to improve the condition of the country and people as well. In this work he was greatly assisted by Roger, created Bishop of Salisbury, who, first as Chancellor and then as Justiciar, organized the Curia Regis, or King's Court, which served at once as an advisory body, a tribunal for important judicial decisions, and a treasury board. Smaller than the Great Council, sometimes called by the same name, the Curia Regis included the great officers of the royal household: the Chamberlain, the Constable, the Butler, and the Steward, officers who had originally acted as servants to the King, had made his bed, had groomed his horses, poured his drink, and provided his meals, but whose duties became, in course of time, purely honorary, hereditary in certain great families. Another class of members were the chief Ministers of the Crown: the Justiciar, the Chancellor, and the Treasurer. The Justiciar acted as Regent during the King's absence, as his right-hand man when he was in the country, and presided over the Curia Regis. The Chancellor, or royal secretary, was keeper of the records;[1] gradually he became a very important official, was custodian of the Great Seal — which had to be affixed to all the most important documents — and was consulted in the transaction of important business of State. The Treasurer kept the royal hoard. To these three offices men, usually of the clergy, were appointed and were looked at askance by the older nobility. In addition to these

[1] He got his name from the fact that he originally sat behind the *cancelli* or bars of a screen.

two groups, certain important men were selected from time to time from the Great Council.

The Curia Regis held two financial sessions a year, one at Easter and one at Michaelmas (29 September), when they met the sheriffs from the various counties, received their rents, and went over their accounts. For the sums paid in at Easter the sheriff received a tally, which was a stick[1] notched in the side and marked, each notch indicating a certain number of pounds, shillings, and pence: after notches had been cut, the stick was split lengthwise, the Government keeping one half as a check on the sheriff. The Court, in its financial sessions, was called the "Exchequer," from the Latin word for chequers, because the officials sat about a table making up their accounts by means of counters, and, in moving these counters to and fro, looked as if they were playing chequers.[2] As a further means of extending the royal power over the local districts, officials — called Itinerant Justices — were sent into the different counties, where they sat with the sheriffs in the cases in which the King was concerned, *i.e.* Crown pleas;[3] listened to complaints; conveyed the King's wishes to his people; and, what was perhaps originally their most important duty, saw to it that the royal taxes were properly levied and collected.

English Life in Henry's Time. — On the whole the life of the period seems to have been easy and joyous. Chivalry was coming in with its artificial distinctions; but class feeling was much less marked than elsewhere, and the common people were contented with their lot. Hospitality, charity, and love of sport prevailed, so the country could with truth be called "Merry England." If London was small and unpretentious, it was the center of jolly pastimes, cockfights, football games, archery matches, foot races, water sports, and occasional skating. Hunting, feasting, and love of dress were a favorite theme of attack by austere ecclesiastics. For the small villagers pilgrimages to local shrines, the visits of wandering minstrels, and the numerous saints' days furnished constant occasion for merrymaking. In the monasteries there was much good cheer; sometimes we hear of dinners with as many as sixteen courses washed down with copious draughts of wines, cider, and beer.

The Monastic Revival. — In monastic life, however, this period witnessed the beginnings of an earnest revival. From the early part of the previous century new orders had come into being as vital pro-

[1] Hence our term stock.

[2] The name does not come, as some have said, from the fact that the table was covered with a checkered cloth.

[3] Later used to designate serious offenses in which the State was prosecutor.

tests against the declining ideals of the Benedictine and the Cluniac. Chief among these reformed orders was that of the Cistercians. Simplicity and austerity were its ideals, garments were of the plainest and coarsest sort, church ornaments were made of simple brass, iron, and painted wood, and its houses were to be in lonely and desolate places. The professed brethren were to devote themselves to study, while lay brothers were to do all the manual labor. In 1128 the Cistercians came to England, and, in the succeeding years, established many houses, chiefly in the north. Every one has heard of Melrose Abbey in Scotland and Fountains in Yorkshire. By the middle of the twelfth century there were fifty Cistercian houses in England. Their chief industrial pursuit was cattle and sheep raising, and the wool of the Cistercians became a famous article of export. Among others, military-religious orders — founded as a result of the crusading movement — also made their way into England, the Knights Hospitallers, who furnished succor to sick and needy pilgrims on their way to the Holy City, and the Knights Templars, who guarded the roads to the Holy Land. Altogether, well over two hundred new houses were established in the reigns of Henry and his two successors. With increasing wealth abuses crept in among these reformers in their turn. The Cistercians, for instance, are accused of avarice, idleness, luxury, but we must not forget the services they rendered in reclaiming waste lands, furthering useful arts and trades, preserving and spreading learning, in administering charity, and in setting up standards of living which, even if not always observed, were a protest against the brutality and coarseness which they saw about them.

Stephen Received as King of England (1135). — On the death of Henry I the two chief candidates for the throne were Matilda, his daughter, and Stephen of Boulogne, his nephew. Matilda had unquestionably the better title, but her sex told against her, as did her marriage with the representative of the House of Anjou, long the declared enemy of Englishman and Norman. Stephen, who hastened to England, was promptly accepted by the citizens of London in return for his promises to maintain and to respect the liberties and privileges of the city. At Winchester, of which his brother was Bishop, he came to terms with the Church, granting concessions in the matter of elections and jurisdiction greater than it had ever enjoyed on English soil. Then, by promises equally lavish, he sought the alliance of the King of Scotland, and of Robert, Earl of Gloucester, Matilda's half brother.

His Character and Problems. — Personally Stephen was a man of the most engaging qualities, but totally incompetent to deal with

the problems which confronted him. He was unable to fulfill the promises which he had so rashly made, he was not keen and foreseeing enough to anticipate the opposition which the nobility, turbulent and self-seeking as ever, were bound to manifest. He excited animosity by bringing mercenaries into the land, and he weakened his position by creating new Earls and allowing them to build castles. "The more he gave them, the worse they always carried themselves toward him." Moreover, in the very first revolts directed against him he showed himself too easy to punish disaffections even after he had put them down.

His Attacks on Roger of Salisbury and His Family (1139). — Like many mild men he was capable of sudden acts of violence and rashness. Such a blunder he committed by a foolhardy attack on Roger of Salisbury and his family, who between them controlled the financial and judicial business of the Government. Suddenly Stephen ordered them to surrender their castles into his hands, and when they refused, eventually arrested them all. He may have feared that they were combining against him in favor of Matilda, he may have been merely jealous of their increasing power and pretensions, which were truly regal, but his action was disastrous in its consequences. It threw the financial and judicial system into a confusion from which it did not recover till the next reign and it alienated most of the King's supporters in the Church. Even his own brother Bishop Henry declared against him. The situation was particularly critical. In 1138 an invasion of the Scots was only turned back by the dauntless efforts of the Archbishop of York, and, meanwhile, the southwestern counties had risen, at the instigation of Robert of Gloucester, who had thrown off his allegiance and fled abroad, alleging that Stephen was a usurper and had not kept his promises to him.

The Coming of Matilda and the Civil War (1139–1148). — Such was the situation when, in the autumn of 1139, Robert and Matilda appeared in person. Their arrival converted the unrest, already manifest, into a civil war, which lasted for fourteen years. The disputed succession was only a pretext which the barons seized to foster disorder and thereby to gain power and profit for themselves. They built castles; they "greatly oppressed the wretched people," and, to extort their property from them, tortured them "with pains unspeakable." Many fled and many starved, "The earth bare no corn, you might as well have tilled the sea, for the land was all ruined by such deeds, and it was said openly that Christ and his saints slept." The years following the arrival of Robert of Gloucester and Matilda were marked by a bewildering series of raids, sieges, and ravaging of towns,

with the balance swaying first on one side and then on the other. At length, however, Matilda began to lose ground; the death of Robert, in 1147, deprived her of her chief support, and in the following year she retired to Anjou and gave up the struggle. Yet her retirement gave neither peace to England nor a clear title to Stephen; for her son Henry, now fifteen years old, was soon to take up the fight for his heritage. Moreover, the barons, in their own interests, were determined to continue the carnival of misrule: "every lord of a castle was a petty king, ruling his own tenants, coining his own money, administering his own justice." One great source of encouragement to the party opposed to Stephen was the conquest of Normandy in 1144 by Geoffrey of Anjou who, steadily refusing to take any part in the English complications, had been persistent in his attacks in the Duchy since the death of Henry I. Louis VII, King of France, recognized his victory by investing him with the Dukedom, and before the close of another year, he had stamped out the last embers of resistance.

Treaty of Wallingford (1153). — Geoffrey died in 1151. Already, some months before, he had handed over the Duchy of Normandy to his young son Henry, and his death added to Henry's possessions the lands of Anjou and Maine. By marrying, 1152, Eleanor, heiress of Aquitaine, he acquired a vast addition of territory. Soon after his marriage Henry set out for England. Stephen fought doggedly for a time, but, in 1153, the Treaty of Wallingford was arranged, by which Stephen was to continue as King during his lifetime, while Henry was recognized as his heir in order to put an end to the disorders which had so long prevailed. Crown lands were to be resumed, foreign mercenaries were to be banished, all castles built since the death of Henry I were to be destroyed and Stephen was to consult his prospective heir in all important acts. Stephen died in 1154, and it was left to a young man of twenty-one to mend the evils which had come upon the land during the nineteen years' rule of a man who was as generous and kindly as he was weak.

Results of Stephen's Reign. — At first sight the reign of Stephen appears to be nothing more than a period of anarchy and suffering, but it brought the people a useful lesson, or reënforced an old one, that the rule of a strong King, harsh and despotic though he might be, was to be preferred to the unrestricted sway of local magnates. Viewed in this light, the reign contributed as much to strengthen the central government against feudal independence as the work of a William the Conqueror or a Henry Beauclerk. On the other hand, the barons were not the only force that threatened the unity and security

of the land. The prevailing uncertainty, and the aim of the contending parties to secure the support of a powerful and influential institution brought the Church into a position of prominence that later Kings had to reckon with.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

Freeman's *Norman Conquest*, IV, V, is still valuable for an exhaustive account of the events from 1060 to 1154, though Freeman was inclined to minimize the effects of the Conquest and many of his findings have been reversed by recent investigators. Briefer and more modern narratives are to be found in Ramsay, *Foundations of England*, II; H. W. C. Davis, *England under the Normans and Angevins* (1905), and G. B. Adams, *Political History of England* (1905). Both of the latter works embody the results of recent scholarship; and Davis pays much attention to the non-political aspects of the period, presenting an interesting picture of conditions under the Anglo-Norman kings.

For brief accounts of the constitutional aspects of the subject, see works already cited. A more detailed treatment will be found in Stubbs' *Constitutional History*, I. Good brief accounts of feudalism are given in E. Emerton, *Introduction to the Middle Ages* (1891); G. B. Adams, *Civilization during the Middle Ages* (1898) ch. IX, especially valuable; Seignobos (tr. E. W. Dow), *Feudal Régime;* and J. H. Robinson, *History of Western Europe* (1902). The feudal incidents are discussed in detail in Pollock and Maitland, *English Law*, I, bk. II, ch. I, and J. S. McKechnie, *Magna Carta* (1913), pp. 52–77. Pollock and Maitland treat Norman and Anglo-Norman Law in I, bk. I, chs. III, IV.

For the Church see Wakeman, Makower, and W. R. Stephens, *English Church* (1901).

For social and industrial conditions, in addition to works already referred to, see Mary Bateson, *Mediaeval England* (1904); R. E. Prothero, *English Farming Past and Present* (1913), the most recent and authoritative work covering the whole period of English agriculture. References to sources and for further reading, Davis, 534–544; Adams, *Political History*, 448–458; and White, XXVI.

Selections from the sources, Adams and Stephens, *Select Documents of English Constitutional History*, nos. 1–11, especially 1 and 7.

CHAPTER VII

HENRY II (1154–1189). THE RESTORATION OF THE ROYAL POWER AND THE RISE OF THE ENGLISH COMMON LAW

Henry II, Founder of the Angevin or Plantagenet Line.[1] — Henry II, a boy barely turned twenty-one, was the first representative of a new line which continued in unbroken succession for two hundred and forty-five years. Of feverish energy and uncommon endurance, he was, when not engaged in war or State business, either hunting or hawking or deep in a book or in conversation with some of the learned men whom he delighted to gather about him. Subject at times to ungovernable fits of passion, he was generally good-humored and easy of access. Resuming forthwith the good work begun by his grandfather, Henry I, which had been all undone by nineteen years of anarchy, it was his aim to subdue the barons, to check the growing power of the Church, to bring its members within the control of the State in worldly things, and to attach the people to their Sovereign by protecting them from oppression and by advancing their welfare. If he did not reach his goal he took the right road and set the course for the future.

His Original Interests not Primarily English. — Henry came to the throne practically a foreigner and apparently never learned to speak the English language. Indeed, England was only a part of the numerous territories which he ruled. At first his only interest in the land was to use it as a source of supply in defending and rounding out his possessions across the Channel; but, after he had undertaken the task of developing his English resources, he became more and more interested in the undertaking for its own sake. Nevertheless, circumstances kept him abroad more than half his reign, which makes it all the more notable that his most enduring work was done in England.

[1] It is sometimes known as the Angevin dynasty, from the fact that Henry on his father's side descended from the Counts of Anjou, sometimes as the Plantagenet, possibly from the emblem of Geoffrey of Anjou, a sprig of broom (Latin — *planta genesta*) which he wore in his hat.

Thomas Becket. — One of his first steps was to set in motion again the administrative machinery which had come to a standstill, and, of all the appointments which he made, that of Chancellor was fraught with the greatest consequences. Thomas Becket, whom he selected, was the son of a Norman merchant settled in London, and had been educated for the Church. Although he was a striking contrast to his master, fifteen years older and much more sumptuous in his tastes, he and Henry became fast friends; they worked together, they hunted together, and on occasion they romped like schoolboys. But immersed as he was in worldly business and luxury and so martial that he more than once rode in the King's armies, the life of Thomas Becket was so pure that even his enemies found no word to say against him.

The Opening of the Conflict between Becket and Henry (1163). — A time came when the firm friends were turned into bitter enemies. In 1161, Henry determined to appoint Thomas Archbishop of Canterbury. The Chancellor resisted stoutly, for it was his nature to champion to the utmost any cause which he undertook, and he realized that, as head of the English Church, he would be bound to come in conflict with the royal policy. His scruples, however, were overborne, and, in 1162, he assumed the office of Archbishop of Canterbury. Without delay, he resigned the Chancellorship and all his worldly interests and became an ascetic of the most extreme type as well as a most ardent defender of Church privilege. Not many months passed before he had broken with the King, though curiously enough, the first quarrel arose over a point which did not concern the Church at all. Henry demanded that the sheriffs should pay into the royal treasury a certain "aid" or fee which they had been accustomed to collect from the shires in payment for their work; Thomas, at a council held in 1163, took the part of the sheriffs, thus becoming the first English subject on record to resist his Sovereign on a question of national taxation. This breach was followed by many others in rapid succession, but the climax was reached in the struggle over criminous clerks.

The Criminous Clerks. — William the Conqueror, in separating lay and spiritual jurisdiction, had failed to draw a definite line between the two classes of cases; but he and his sons had apparently kept the clergy under the control of their courts in matters of temporal concern. In the troublous time of Stephen the Church courts had greatly extended their powers, and, among other things, claimed the exclusive right to judge the offenses of clergymen even if committed against the law of the land. While the Church naturally wanted to protect its servants from profane hands, there was danger, since the sentences

DOMINIONS OF THE
HOUSE OF ANJOU
SCALE OF ENGLISH MILES
0 25 50 100 150
Dominions of the House of Anjou
NORTH SEA
ENGLISH CHANNEL
Irish Channel
BAY OF BISCAY
ULSTER
CONNAUGHT
LEINSTER
MUNSTER
Dundalk
Dublin
Limerick
Waterford
Perth
Stirling
Edinburgh
R. Tweed
R. Spey
R. Dee
R. Tay
Newcastle
Durham
York
R. Humber
Chester
Newark
Leicester
Gloucester
Oxford
London
R. Thames
Bristol
R. Severn
Salisbury
Winchester
Exeter
Rochester
Canterbury
Bruges
Boulogne
FLANDERS
Havre
Rouen
Caen
NORMANDY
Paris
CHAMPAGNE
Troyes
Brest
Quimper
BRITTANY
Rennes
MAINE
Le Mans
Orleans
Angers
Blois
Nantes
R. Loire
R. Seine
R. Yonne
R. Saone
R. Charente
R. Garonne
Limoges
Lyons
Bordeaux
Toulouse
Avignon
R. Adour
R. Rhone
6 West 2 Longitude from Greenwich 2 East
10 6 2 2 6
56
52
48
44

of the ecclesiastical courts were extremely light, that evil doers, by claiming exemption from lay jurisdiction, might escape the consequences of their misdeeds and menace the security of the State. This was what King Henry was determined to prevent. Two or three cases arose at this time of clerks found to be guilty of murder and robbery, and Becket not only refused to have them retried in the King's courts, but even to allow adequate sentences to be pronounced against them. The King summoned a council and ordered the bishops to agree that clerks accused of crime should be called before the King's courts to answer the charges; if well grounded, they should be tried in their episcopal courts in the presence of a King's justice, and if guilty they should be handed over to the lay courts for punishment. The King did not ask that clerks should actually be tried in his courts. At first the bishops, led by Thomas, refused to concede, but they finally agreed, Thomas last of all, to obey the "customs of the realm."

The Constitutions of Clarendon (1164). — Thereupon, Henry assembled a Great Council at Clarendon, in January, 1164, and directed some of the oldest barons of the realm to draw up the "customs" as they had existed in the reign of Henry I. These customs which Henry II presented to Becket and the bishops for acceptance are known as the "Constitutions of Clarendon," and aimed to settle all questions at issue between the King and the clergy. However, they went far beyond the original question in dispute, indeed far beyond any claim that Henry had ever made; for their provisions not only brought the criminous clergy under the cognizance of the King's justice, but fixed the relations between the royal and ecclesiastical courts, and drew into the King's tribunals many cases involving Church property and large court fees. Their general aim was to put the King at the head of the English Church and to subordinate the clergy to his will, to make the law of the land dominant over the law of the Church.

Resistance and Flight of Becket (1164). — Eventually, Becket repudiated the Constitutions as contrary to the law of God and took refuge abroad to escape the wrath of the King. He sought an audience with Alexander III, but Henry's ambassadors had already preceded him. The Pope, who needed Henry's support against a rival anti-Pope, and who, at the same time, did not wish to repudiate Becket as a champion of the Church, was in a delicate situation. Finally, after some hesitation, without formally condemning the Constitutions, he absolved Becket from observing them, except so far as was consistent with his holy orders. For six years, from 1164 to 1170, the quarrel continued, Becket striving with might and main to force the King to recede from his position.

The Murder of Becket, 1170. — At length, in 1170, in order to evade an interdict which the distracted Papacy had finally prepared against him, Henry met the Archbishop, promised amends for a recent disregard of his authority as primate of England, and Thomas agreed to return to Canterbury. As none of the essential points at issue were settled, the reconciliation proved a hollow one, and the Archbishop made matters worse by suspending and excommunicating a number of his opponents. Henry received the news with a furious outburst of passion. "My subjects are sluggards, men of no spirit," he roared, "they keep no faith with their lord, they allow me to be made the laughing stock of a low-born clerk." At once four knights hastened to Canterbury, and after a heated interview with Becket they murdered him within the precincts of the Cathedral. Almost immediately miracles began to be wrought at his burial place, in less than three years' time he was canonized, and his shrine became the most popular of English centers for pilgrims. Henry had persecuted him in mean and petty ways, even if he did not intentionally cause his death; but the cause for which the Archbishop contended — the exemption of the clergy from State control and the supremacy of the Church in important matters of temporal concern — was a political, not a religious one, and his death brought to his cause a greater victory than he would ever have been able to gain had he lived. Public opinion held Henry accountable for the base deed for which he was only indirectly responsible, so that he was obliged to seek reconciliation with the Pope at the expense of humiliating concessions.

Henry in Ireland. State of the Country. — While he was waiting to see what the Pope would do he turned his attention to Ireland, first granted as an English possession by Adrian IV in 1154. The Irish, developing in comparative isolation, had attained a degree of culture and a fervor of religious life far in advance of their social and political development. Their zealous missionaries had carried their faith even to wildest parts of the German lands, they had beautiful legends and sweet-tongued bards, they excelled in the illuminating of manuscripts; but the people were still in the tribal stage, law and order were sadly lacking, while the kings and chiefs were constantly warring against one another. Cattle was the chief standard of value, houses were primitive, clothing was scanty, and there was a dearth of arable land. In 1166, when the King of Leinster, hard pressed by rivals, appealed to Henry for aid, the English King allowed him to enlist volunteers among his subjects. Chief of the recruits was Richard de Clare, Earl of Pembroke, known as "Strongbow," who was followed by men from England, Wales, and from the Continent, restless

and needy adventurers, eager for any stirring or profitable undertaking. Henry went over in person largely from apprehension of the growing power of Strongbow. During his stay in the country, from October, 1171, to April, 1172, he was able to secure the submission of most of the native rulers, and left officials to represent him; nevertheless, the English intervention, instead of bringing peace and order, added one more element of discord to the troubled country.

Henry's Submission at Avranches. "Benefit of Clergy." — After leaving Ireland Henry crossed to Normandy, and at Avranches came to terms with the papal legates and received absolution. He swore that he had not instigated the murder of Becket, that he would support Alexander III, and, without mentioning the Constitutions of Clarendon, agreed to do away with any customs introduced against the Church in his time. As a matter of fact, his courts continued to claim control over most of the property cases in which the Church was involved, though clergymen accused of criminal offenses claimed exemption from the lay courts — "benefit of clergy" it was called — for centuries.

Henry's Remaining Years and Death. — Henry's remaining years continued to be clouded with difficulties. His sons were discontented with the niggardly revenues and small authority which he allowed them; he was on bad terms with his Queen, Eleanor; most of the barons were restive under his firm rule; while Louis VII stirred up strife to increase his own possessions. Thanks to the selfish and conflicting aims of his opponents and to his own promptitude, Henry was able, with the aid of mercenaries and a few faithful followers to suppress a revolt which broke out, in 1173, under the lead of his eldest son, Prince Henry. Yet, to the very end of his days, he had to contend against the feudal barons on the French side of the water, against the King of France, and against two of his sons, Richard and John. One fruitful source of difficulty was the redistribution of his lands, complicated by the death of Prince Henry, in 1183. In 1188, the two younger brothers joined Philip II, who had succeeded Louis VII as King of France, and Henry, old, discouraged, and sick, had to consent to their terms. Turning on his bed he muttered: "Now let all things go as they will, I care no more for myself, nor for the world." He died shortly after, in 1189, repeating in his last hours: "Shame, shame on a beaten King."

Henry's Constitutional and Legal Reforms. — From this sad end to a still sadder struggle with treacherous and undutiful sons it is a relief to turn to a survey of those aspects of Henry's work which have given him deservedly a place among England's greater Kings. In

the field of domestic legislation and preëminently in legal reform he marked an epoch in progress. His Norman ancestors had begun the work of shaping the law as it exists to-day in the English-speaking world: they had wrought to break down or prevent the growth of special privileges, to unify conflicting customs, to introduce trained judges, organize courts, improve methods of procedure; in short to construct that system of common law — or law based on custom, usages, and court decision — and the methods of administering it, which it has been the work of succeeding centuries to perfect in detail. So Henry II did not originate this work, but he contributed so much toward the process of development that his reign was truly "a critical period in the history of English law." The legal and constitutional edifice begun by William I and Henry I was demolished during the anarchy of Stephen's reign, and Henry II had to rebuild practically from the foundation.

The Political and Legal Problem. — Although he had the interests of his subjects somewhat at heart, his foremost aim was political, to strengthen the royal powers at the expense of the Church and the barons. To this end he reorganized, strengthened, and consolidated the old courts, established new ones, and, as a means of outbidding his rivals, introduced novel and improved methods of procedure in criminal and civil causes. As a result, before the close of his reign the King's courts and judges, instead of being exceptional resorts for great men and great causes, had come to exercise, as a matter of course, a vast and steadily increasing jurisdiction. When Henry and his judges began their work, law and procedure were as yet confused, conflicting, and disorganized. Anglo-Saxon law was still administered in the hundred and county courts; aside from private and inadequate compilations, the law was practically unwritten; the Anglo-Norman officials who administered it, even though they might be willing to respect local customs, understood them imperfectly at best. Moreover, manorial, borough, and other special courts enjoyed great powers and privileges. Obviously, if the royal power continued to increase, it would seek to bring order out of this chaos. If a more logical and uniform system could not be fashioned out of the existing native elements, help might be sought elsewhere.

Henry II Prevents the Roman Law from Becoming the Law of England. — Beyond the Alps, just at this time, there was coming to life again a code admirably suited to meet the needs of western Europe. This was the law of the old Roman Empire or Roman law, codified by order of the Emperor Justinian in the sixth century — a fusion of the practice and principles of a people of unparalleled legal genius

and administrative experience. Although it had fallen into oblivion during the period of formation of the new Germanic states on the ruins of the Western Empire, the twelfth century witnessed its revival at the recently established University of Bologna. Students began to flock to Italy, and as time went on, doctors of law gradually made their way to France, England, and the Germanic Empire. The same century also marked an epoch in the development of the canon law, or law of the Church of Rome. In the thirteenth century the Roman civil law secured a permanent foothold in France, and in the fifteenth century we find it domiciled in Germany, but, except in the ecclesiastical and chancery courts, it never obtained any considerable hold in England. It is due to the work of Henry II that it did not, for, while in other countries no single system existed able to dispute the superior claims of the intrusive guest, Henry II so simplified and unified divergent practices that by the time the Roman law was in a position to make itself felt in the Island, the common law was too widespread and too firmly founded to be supplanted by an alien rival.

Henry II Brings the Jury into General Use. — Henry recognized that if his system of justice was to prevail it behooved him to introduce better methods than those already in vogue. His measures witness how completely he outbid his rivals. For instance, he brought into general use juries for accusing criminals and for deciding disputed points at law — the parents of our modern grand and petty juries. Curiously enough, this bulwark of English liberty, long regarded as an Anglo-Saxon heritage, was of royal and foreign origin. Starting from the inquest, a device of the Frankish emperors who sent around officials to gather information on the sworn testimony of the communities they visited, the system, much developed on French soil, was brought to England by William the Conqueror from his Norman home. He and his sons employed it for various purposes, among other things to get information in judicial cases where the royal interest was involved. At first allowed for privileged subjects as an exceptional favor, Henry extended it to all. By the presentment jury, consisting usually of twelve men from each hundred, criminals were brought to account by men sworn to voice the common report of their vicinage. Inquisition or recognition juries, or assizes,[1] enabled men to determine their rights of possession against an intruder by forms of procedure juster and more summary than they had even before dreamed of. Moreover, by a royal decree it was first made possible to defend ownership by the testimony of those who knew the facts of the case, and to

[1] The word "assize" has many meanings: a royal enactment, a form of trial, an early form of jury, a judicial session.

avoid the brutal and inconclusive trial by combat. Writs were devised by which such cases could be drawn into the royal courts which, in spite of their many shortcomings, gave speedier and more impartial hearings than those whose jurisdictions they invaded.

The Development of the Jury. — Henry's juries were strikingly different from the bodies familiar to us. Members were at first chosen for their knowledge of the facts in the case to be decided, though gradually they came to supplement their personal knowledge by information acquired by a private examination of documents and men not in the panel. The separation of the witnesses from the jurors was a process of slow growth, for it was not till the fifteenth century that the former came to testify in open court. Moreover, the earliest trial juries — inquisition or recognition juries as they were then called — dealt only with civil cases; in criminal cases the jury introduced by Henry II was concerned only with the presentment or accusation of offenders whose ultimate fate was still decided by the ordeal. But this form of test practically disappeared when Innocent III, in 1215, forbade the clergy to participate in trials where it was used. So new juries were introduced to decide on the truth of the facts presented by the accusation jury. Oftentimes, however, the new jury might be the original body of accusers acting in the new capacity. Long practically obsolete, trial by battle was not abolished till 1819 and compurgation not till 1833.

Reorganization of the Courts and Administrative Reforms. — Aside from the introduction of the jury into general use there were many other instances of Henry's legal and administrative activity. He restored the Curia Regis and Exchequer founded by Henry I. In 1178, he selected from the former body two clerks and three laymen to hear certain important cases, thus creating the parent of the later courts of King's Bench and Common Pleas. Then he marked England anew into circuits and sent out itinerant justices to represent him in the courts of the hundred and shire. In 1181, by his famous Assize of Arms, he took steps to reorganize the military forces in a more serviceable way by providing that every free subject of the realm should arm himself according to his property, and it is interesting to notice that, in determining each man's liability, he made use of the sworn testimony of neighbors.

Revenue. — Though Henry II was always on the lookout for money, his income was barely adequate for his needs. One source of additional revenue came from the increased royal courts. The old Danegeld of two shillings a hide ceased to be levied soon after his accession, and in its place he imposed new levies in the counties and in the towns.

Scutage, a tax on each knight's fee which the King might impose in lieu of military service, originated under Henry I, but was greatly increased by Henry II, because it gave him funds for mercenaries to use in his Continental wars. One form of taxation first met in his reign is a tax on incomes and personal property. The first levy of this sort was imposed in 1188, and is known as the Saladin Tithe because it called for a tenth of the revenues and goods of subjects to assist in the recovery of Jerusalem captured by the great Mohammedan warrior Saladin, in the previous year. As in the Assize of Arms the liability of each person assessed was determined by a jury of neighbors.

Summary of the Work of Henry II. — Such was the work of Henry II. As a ruler of many peoples, French and English, he was able to hold together vast dominions against opposing forces. In England he achieved great and far-reaching results: he restored, extended, and defined the organs of central government and increased the power of the Crown against the barons and the Church, and instituted a series of legal reforms from which English-speaking people receive benefit even to-day.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

Narrative. Ramsay, *The Angevin Empire* (1903), and Kate Norgate, *England under the Angevin Kings* (2 vols., 1887), the latter extremely full and interesting. Two very good brief biographies of Henry II are those by Mrs. J. R. Green (1892) and L. F. Salzmann (1915). The best general works on Ireland are E. R. Turner, *Ireland and England. In the Past and in the Present* (1919) and P. W. Joyce, *A Concise History of Ireland*, to 1908 (20th ed., 1914) and the latter's *Short History of Ireland*, to 1608 (3d ed., 1904). John Morris, *The Life and Martyrdom of St. Becket* (2d ed., 1885) is the standard life of Becket. R. L. Poole, *The Exchequer in the Twelfth Century* (1912), the most recent and scholarly work on the subject.

References for further reading same as ch. VI.

Selections from the sources, Adams and Stephens, nos. 12–20.

CHAPTER VIII

RICHARD I (1189–1199) AND THE TRANSITION FROM ABSOLUTE TOWARD LIMITED MONARCHY. CONDITIONS AT THE CLOSE OF THE TWELFTH CENTURY

Twofold Nature of Richard's Reign. — In September, 1189, Richard, surnamed Cœur de Lion, or the Lion-Hearted, the eldest surviving son of Henry II, was crowned King of England. "A knight errant" had "succeeded a statesman," but the change was not at first very marked, because, with the exception of a few months in 1189 and 1194, the new King was absent from England throughout his reign of nearly ten years, and the Government was carried on by Ministers who sought, in the main, to continue the policy of Henry II. The reign then has to be considered from two points of view: one deals with personal exploit and adventures; the other with points of constitutional advance, notably the growth of the representative principle in the system of administration employed by the central government in the local centers.

His Personal Character. — Richard had many faults: he was an undutiful son, he was unscrupulous in extortion, and had little interest or capacity in problems of statesmanship. Yet he had his redeeming features: he was a "splendid savage" with the virtues and vices of the medieval hero; he was warm-hearted, generous, and magnanimous toward his enemies; moreover, much of the money which he squeezed from subjects he devoted to a cause that was regarded as the highest in which men could engage, the winning of the Holy City from the enemies of Christ. As a general he was the genius of his age. His romantic nature, his fondness for poetry and music mark him as a Frenchman rather than an Englishman.

Departure for the Third Crusade. — Directly after his coronation Richard, having pledged himself to join Philip II of France in driving Saladin from the Holy Land, began to raise money for the Crusade and to provide for the government during his absence. William Longchamp, Chancellor and Justiciar, stood almost alone in representing the interests of the King; on the other hand, he took with him some

of his most trustworthy servants, leaving behind many disaffected, some of them naturally embittered, because he had confiscated their estates for alleged disloyalty — for adhering to him against the late King, his father. He excused men from accompanying him on the Crusade in return for money payments, and besides sold everything he could, offices, lands, privileges, and favors; some men paid to resign offices, others to acquire them. Richard left England in December, 1189; but, owing to delays, did not until June of 1191 reach the scene of the fighting, where the French King had arrived before him. Shortly after the capture of Acre in July, Philip returned home on the plea of illness, though his real reason was to take advantage of Richard's absence to improve his own affairs. With his remaining allies the English King marched on Jerusalem, and though they managed twice to get within striking distance, they failed to capture the city, after which, much against Richard's will, they turned back. Meantime, very disquieting news arrived from England. Richard's younger brother John, crossing over from Normandy, had become involved in a war with Longchamp and had succeeded in getting the Great Council to depose the Justiciar and to declare him heir to the throne in the event of his brother's death without issue.

Treachery of John. Capture and Imprisonment of Richard. — In October, 1192, Richard left Palestine never to return. On his voyage home he was captured and handed over to the Emperor, Henry VI, who, besides itching for ransom, nursed a number of grievances against the English King. Philip and John were overjoyed at the capture; but the prospect of 150,000 marks and Richard's promise to do homage for England and his other lands induced the Emperor to agree to his release.

Richard in England, March to May (1194). — John and Philip were baffled in their efforts to prolong Richard's captivity and seize his kingdom. Though he was received with greatest enthusiasm by his subjects, he only remained in the country from March to May, 1194, and employed most of his time in selling again the offices and honors already sold to provide for the third Crusade. Disloyalty furnished him a good pretext, though he spared the lands of John and rather contemptuously forgave him for his treachery. In addition to sales and confiscations, Richard levied heavy taxes to carry on a war of revenge against Philip, and departed, as it turned out, forever.

The Administration of Hubert Walter (1194–1198). — For the next four years the government was in the hands of Hubert Walter, Archbishop of Canterbury and Justiciar, a man trained in the methods of Henry II. Intrusted with the task of keeping order and supplying Richard's constant demands for money, the credit for the constitu-

tional and administrative progress of the period is due to him. Though charged with avarice and extortion he did much to conciliate the middle classes, to confer self-government on important towns, and to extend the jury system and make it more representative.

His instructions to the itinerant justices in 1194 and in 1198 introduced important reforms. The justices in 1194 were ordered to provide for the election by the suitors, or those entitled to attend the court in each county, of four crowners or coroners to decide what were crown pleas and to reserve them for the royal judges. Both the instructions for 1194 and 1198 required that the presentment juries, hitherto appointed by the sheriff, should be selected by four knights chosen in the county court. Moreover, these juries, who formerly confined their activities to criminal accusations, were instructed to report on all sorts of royal business. Certain of Hubert's measures miscarried. In 1197, Hugh, Bishop of Lincoln, refused in the Great Council to contribute to a sum for equipping three hundred knights to serve abroad for a year, thus establishing a precedent for resistance to an unpopular tax. Then in 1198, a new land tax, designed to replace the old Danegeld, yielded very disappointing returns. Meantime, in 1196, William "Longbeard," a London alderman, when accused of stirring up the poor to sack the houses of the wealthy, took sanctuary in the Bow Church. Hubert smoked him out by setting the edifice on fire, whereupon the monks of Canterbury, who owned the Church, denounced the act to the Pope as sacrilege. The Pope demanded his removal from the Justiciarship, and Richard, disappointed at his two recent failures to raise money, agreed. Hubert, however, retained his office of Archbishop and became Chancellor early in the next reign.

Richard's Death (1199). Results of the Reign. — Richard, in 1199, was mortally wounded during one of his many wars in France. Although the Crusade and his conflicts with Philip of France were nearer to his heart than the welfare of his English subjects, they really contributed to English constitutional development, since the money they necessitated developed the machinery of representation, and at the same time awakened forces of opposition which later made use of this machinery against the Crown.

Secular Character of the Period. Learning at Henry's Court. — Perhaps the most striking feature of the age of Henry II and his sons is its worldly or secular character. The death of Becket brought to an abrupt pause an intellectual and moral revival which, under the influence of higher clergy and monks, had shown its force as early as the reign of Henry I. On the other hand, science was mainly sub-

ordinated to theology and, for that reason, made little progress. Partly owing to the number of quacks, notably in medicine and astrology, but most of all because of the superstition of the age, men of science were under suspicion and justified their pursuit of forbidden knowledge by curious apologies, generally to the effect that it aided in the comprehension of theological subjects. Although Paris and Chartres were centers of classical learning, and John of Salisbury, the foremost scholar of his time, was an enthusiast on the subject, even the classics had to yield the palm to law and logic. However, in spite of the material and bigoted character of the age, Henry II and many of his family were well educated, alert, and interested in learning. This is true even of King John, the blackest of the dark sheep; for the story that he got his reputation from having once borrowed a book of the Abbot of St. Albans is unjust. Many learned men, though more particularly historians and legal scholars, surrounded the King, and there was much intercourse with foreign countries, diplomatic, ecclesiastical, and scholarly.

Legal and Historical Writing. — As one might expect, the writings of the period were mainly of a legal and historical character. In the reign of Henry II appeared a *Treatise Concerning the Laws and Customs of the Kingdom of England*, notable as the first systematic treatment of the subject ever produced in the country. It was formerly ascribed to Henry's great Justiciar, Ranulf de Glanville, though it is quite possible that the author was his nephew Hubert Walter. To Richard Fitzneal, Treasurer, and Bishop of London, we owe the *Dialogue of the Exchequer*, describing the organization and procedure of that celebrated financial body. The chronicles of the period differ greatly from the earlier ones; while they are annals, bare notes of events, they are written by men in the midst of affairs, busy statesmen and diplomats and not by solitary monks; moreover, they reach out beyond the boundaries of England and deal with what is going on in Europe and with the Orient which the Crusades had opened to western Christendom. One work that stands out as really historical, that tries to grasp events and to interpret their meaning, is William of Newburgh's *History of English Things*, the production of a canon of a remote priory in Yorkshire. Since too, he was the first to denounce the mass of fable which that unblushing romancer Geoffrey of Monmouth passed off as history, he has sometimes been called "the father of historical criticism."

Walter Map and Giraldus Cambrensis. — Two writers throw vivid lights on the conditions in which they lived. One was Walter Map, a versatile, many-sided man of great learning. His only surviving

work, *Courtiers' Triflings*, is an interesting scrapbook on all sorts of subjects with the dominating aim of satirizing the Church and clergy and the follies and vices of the court. The other was Gerald the Welshman, or Giraldus Cambrensis as he is more commonly called, who wrote a valuable and lively account of the conquest of Ireland as well as topographical descriptions both of that country and of his native Wales. Although his Irish works are manifestly hostile to the natives and full of wild and horrible tales, they are among the few sources for the period. Gerald produced many other works on various subjects; and has been characterized as "the father of English popular literature." These works were all in Latin. First in the reign of John, Layamon, a simple Worcestershire priest, in his *Brut*, or legendary history of Brutus and Britain, set himself "to tell the noble deeds of Englishmen" in the English tongue — the earliest seed of a noble national literary revival.

The Rise of the Universities. — In the last years of Henry II England's most ancient seat of learning, Oxford, came into prominence, although it was not formally known as a "University" till the reign of his grandson Henry III. One of the most notable features of the twelfth century is the rise of the universities. The earliest teachers in England as elsewhere were in schools attached to monasteries, cathedrals, parish churches, and occasionally to a royal court. Gradually, however, groups of students began to gather in this place or that to hear some man famous for learning or eloquence; then, as time went on, groups, sometimes of masters, sometimes of scholars, organized themselves into corporations or gilds called universities. Originally meaning any body of men in a collective capacity, the term *universitas* came at length to be restricted to those combined together for learning or teaching, with the aim of regulating conditions of membership and methods of instruction. Oxford traces its origin to an expulsion of English students from the University of Paris about 1167. There had been teachers at Oxford before this date, but they had taught merely in a private capacity.[1] The university of Cambridge apparently owes its origin to one of the town and gown conflicts common in early times, which led to a migration from Oxford in 1209, though it was not till 1318 that the younger institution secured formal recognition.

Conditions at the Universities. — Conditions were at first very primitive. The students lodged with the townsmen, and the masters lectured wherever they could, sometimes in the open air with their

[1] There is a story that a famous canonist Vacarius, silenced by Stephen, lectured there, but it rests on no adequate evidence. He probably taught at Canterbury.

classes sitting about them on the bare ground. During the course of the thirteenth century houses began to be established for communities of poor scholars. These have developed into the modern colleges with organized bodies of masters, fellows, and scholars. Studies were grouped under various heads — liberal arts, theology, law, and, in some universities, medicine — each with its faculty or recognized hierarchy of teachers and governors. The faculty of arts gave instruction in the seven liberal arts, divided into the *trivium*, which included grammar, rhetoric, and dialectics, and the *quadrivium*, including geometry, arithmetic, music, and astronomy.

Growth of Towns since the Conquest. — The progress of boroughs and cities was marked by new and important stages during the reign of the sons of Henry II. It should be recalled that before the Conquest they were distinguished by certain well-recognized characteristics: they were walled, they were under a special peace, they enjoyed certain market rights, and they paid a lump sum known as *firma burgi*, or farm of the borough, in place of the dues and taxes customarily collected by the sheriff. Concessions purchased from Kings after the Conquest were recorded in charters, which either confirmed old liberties and privileges or allowed new ones. Those to London were the most important and were much in advance of the others, for which they served to a large extent as models. While that of William I was little more than a promise in general terms that the liberties and property of the City should not be disturbed, Henry I, in 1100, granted a charter containing distinct concessions: in return for £300 a year he abandoned all revenues from Middlesex; he allowed the citizens to appoint their sheriff and to hold their court; he exempted them from trial by battle, from special tolls and exactions as well as from a number of general imposts; and limited fines or amercements in amount. No notable gains came under Henry II: he granted many charters; but as a rule they did nothing more than to confirm liberties enjoyed in his grandfather's time. The reign of Richard I, however, marked a distinct stage in the progress of English municipal autonomy. The main aim was doubtless to get money, though some see in the royal policy an intelligent recognition of the signs of the times. Perhaps the most interesting concession — to London, in 1191 — was granted not by Richard, but by John to secure the aid of the city against William Longchamp. While some features of the grant have been variously interpreted, the right to have a mayor is clear enough, and in the Lord Mayor, together with the board of aldermen, and a common council subsequently added, the government of the City is vested to-day.

The Gilds. — Side by side with the municipal governments, other organizations grew up with the primary aim of controlling commerce, trade, and industry. These gilds, as they were called, were, in the original medieval sense, private voluntary societies for mutual help and pleasure. Some were merely social or religious in character. The merchant gilds, whose purpose was to further the trading privileges of members and to exclude from competition all non-members, date from the eleventh century and became very numerous in the twelfth. In course of time these gild merchants came to control a large number of the town governments and even in many cases to take their place. They were wealthy and exclusive bodies, a feature that led the handicraftsmen, according to a widely accepted view, to organize associations of their own, known as craft gilds. Of the latter sort, the earliest known is that of the weavers, who received a charter from Henry I, while, in the course of the twelfth and the following century, the bakers, the fullers, the grocers, the butchers, the clothiers, and many other mysteries, or crafts, came to have their separate organizations. The central government and the municipal authorities seem to have looked on their growth with some disfavor, or were, at least, very jealous in guarding their rights of granting them licenses.[1] It would seem that the opposition existing between the aristocratic merchants and the humbler craftsmen has been exaggerated. At any rate a common motive of the latter in organizing craft gilds was not so much hostility to the gild merchants as a desire to raise their own standards of production and conditions of labor. London never had a gild merchant; but her craft gilds, growing in wealth and importance, came to take an important share in the government of the City.

Markets and Fairs. Foreign Trade. Growth of London. — With the growth of trade and industry there was also an increase in the number of markets, where local products were disposed of, and of fairs, held at less frequent intervals, to which people, foreigners as well as natives, came from far and near to buy and sell. Naturally there was much rivalry between neighboring markets, involving disputes as to their respective rights. Some were settled peaceably, in other cases the contending parties resorted to club law. London at this time was steadily increasing its trade relations with the merchant cities of northern Germany and the Low Countries.[2] With the

[1] A curious case occurred in 1201 when the citizens of London bought from John the privilege of turning out the weavers' gild. Having received the money he turned to the weavers and got them to pay him to take them under the royal protection, thus nullifying the privilege which he had just sold.

[2] In 1194, Richard, supplementing an earlier concession of Henry II, granted to the citizens of Cologne a gild hall in the city, and probably the hall, known from

extension of trade and the increase of wealth considerable building was undertaken, which may explain an interesting ordinance of 1212, framed by the common council to provide against fire. Wooden houses were to be replaced by stone at dangerous points such as the market place; thenceforth no thatched roofs were allowed, only tiles, wooden shingles, and lead might be used; a tub of water must be placed before each building; and cooks and bakers might not work at night.

Rural Life. — Among rural classes the customary services were apparently becoming lighter, with a consequently increasing tendency to substitute rents in money and kind in their place. Moreover, rents were rising, for the tillers of the soil were beginning to share in the general prosperity. Even at that, some payments were successfully resisted, — as when the cellarer and the men of the Abbot of Bury, in a forcible attempt to collect reap-silver, were stopped by a body of old women who berated them with hard words and threatened them with saucepans. Some villeins rose from the ranks to become great scholars and prelates, yet, in general, the lot of the villein was a hard one and there was ordinarily little hope of bettering it. They were occasionally sold apart from the land as late as the thirteenth century; toward the end of the twelfth the Canons of Osney bought one man for twenty shillings, another for four pounds and a horse. Living conditions were grievous: leprosy and skin diseases prevailed, while lack of drainage and ventilation, the difficulty of communication, and the necessity of subsisting on salted fish and meats made the winters cheerless and unhealthy.

Fusion of Races. — In spite of serious obstacles, Henry II and the Ministers who carried on his work had wrought well; their administrative and judicial reforms, aided by time, had welded Saxon and Norman into a united English people, while the foreign policy of the King and his son Richard had secured for England a recognized place among the powers of Europe.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

Narrative. Besides Ramsay, Davis, G. B. Adams, Norgate already mentioned, Stubbs, *Historical Introductions to the Rolls Series* (ed. Hassall 1902) — a volume made up of Bishop Stubbs's introductions to certain of the *Chronicles and Memorials of Great Britain*, commonly known as the "Rolls Series," and embodying some of the soundest work on the periods.

the fourteenth century as the Steelyard, which came to be the headquarters of the Hanseatic merchants, dates from this period.

Medley has a good brief account of the origin and development of boroughs; for a fuller treatment see A. Ballard, *The English Boroughs in the Twelfth Century* (1914). Stephens covers this period on the Church. For social and intellectual conditions, in addition to the works already cited, see two brilliant and learned lectures on "Learning and Literature at the Court of Henry II" in Stubbs, *Lectures on Mediaeval and Modern History* (1900). The standard work on the universities is H. Rashdall, *The Universities of the Middle Ages* (2 vols., 1895).

Selections from the sources, Adams and Stephens, no. 21.

CHAPTER IX

THE REIGN OF JOHN (1199–1216). THE LOSS OF NORMANDY, THE QUARREL WITH THE CHURCH, THE BARONIAL REVOLT AND MAGNA CHARTA

Reigns of John and Henry III. — In 1199, after years of intrigue against his brother Richard and against Richard's next lineal heir, his nephew Arthur,[1] John at length attained the Crown. His reign and that of his son Henry III mark the most important constitutional crisis in England's history; they witnessed the first significant limitation of the royal absolutism since the Conquest, together with the rise of an institution that was gradually to voice the will of the nation in such limitation — sharing in the government and ultimately controlling it — the English Parliament. While the chief responsibility for precipitating the crisis by which these changes came about rests with John, circumstances were to some degree operative: the existing sources of supply were inadequate to meet the growing needs of the State, and, in order to secure sufficient revenues, it was necessary to demand more than the customary services and taxes, a demand that was bound to be resisted. To increase the revenues and meet the inevitable discontent, to mold the representatives of the subjects as willing instruments of the royal will would have been a critical problem for a capable and worthy ruler.

Character of John. — Contemporary writers were almost unanimous in their denunciation of John. Giraldus Cambrensis, for example, declared "that of all tyrants of history" he "was the very worst"; truly he was "burdensome to rich and poor," there was no truth or sincerity in him, and "through thirty years of public life," it has been truly said, "we search in vain for any good deed, one kindly act to set against his countless offendings." A younger son, greedy of lands and power, he plotted against his father and against his brother; he was ungrateful to them and to the Ministers who faithfully served him. Cruel, too, beyond measure, he is reported — to cite a single

[1] See table in Introd.

instance — to have wrung 10,000 marks from a rich Jew of Bristol by causing a tooth to be drawn every day until the unfortunate yielded at the end of a week. Very extravagant and self-indulgent and subject to spasms of furious rage, he led a sinful life and sought to atone for it by almsgiving. He manifested an ill-timed levity on solemn occasions and was often strangely apathetic at crises. Yet he was personally brave and not unskilled in arms, he showed moments of fitful energy and was possessed of a certain low cunning. But his lack of foresight, his neglect of opportunity, and his rashness led him to situations, political, diplomatic, and military, which almost invariably ended in defeat.

The Three Critical Events of John's Reign. — Almost at once a blending of impolicy and mishaps plunged the new King into difficulties, and the subsequent course of the reign is marked by three successive crises which came to a head in a great combination of all classes, headed by the barons, resulting in the great charter of liberties known as Magna Carta.

I. The French War and Loss of Normandy. — The first of these crises was the outcome of the war with France. Arthur, a lad of twelve, had been forced to do homage, but he was still not without supporters. Philip Augustus, one of the most astute kings who ever ruled France, wanted to extend his powers at John's expense and was quite ready to use the claims of his rival as a pretext; moreover, there was a growing sentiment in parts of northern France against continuing under English rule. In the face of all this, John committed the first of a series of blunders which led to the triumph of Philip. In the year 1200 he divorced his wife Isabel (sometimes called Avice) of Gloucester and married Isabel of Angoulême, thereby antagonizing not only the powerful family of his discarded wife, but a large section of the Poitevin nobles as well; for the new Isabel had been betrothed to Hugh of Lusignon, one of their number. In order to anticipate any resistance from the family of Hugh, John seized some of their castles and charged their supporters with treason, whereupon the Lusignons appealed to Philip, who, early in 1202, summoned John to appear before a court of his peers at Paris. On his disregard of the summons, Philip declared his fiefs forfeited, and proceeded to make war on his Norman possessions. John, in one of his spasmodic bursts of energy, captured Arthur, who had taken the field in Poitou, and then, so the story goes, went in person to the castle of Rouen whither Arthur had been removed, and had him stabbed and thrown into the Seine, April, 1203. Whether true or not, Arthur disappeared and rumor attributed the crime to John. Without formally charging him with the murder

of his nephew, Philip continued the war with added vigor. One by one John's strongholds opened their gates to him and one by one John's vassals came over to his side, and before the end of the year 1204, Normandy, Anjou, Poitou, indeed every one of John's French possessions except Aquitaine had passed out of his hands. Thus many of the barons, broken off from their Norman connections, were drawn more and more to make common cause with the English people, while for John the loss in prestige was immense, and had no small share in bringing to a head the movement resulting in the crowning event of his reign.

II. The Disputed Archiepiscopal Election (1205). — The death of the great Archbishop Hubert Walter, in 1205, marked the next crisis, for the attempt to fill the vacant See gave rise to complications which led to the King's second great humiliation — the submission to the Papacy. In a conflict over the choice of Hubert's successor the disputants appealed to Rome. Innocent III, one of the greatest of Popes, was ever alert to extend the papal power, so instead of deciding between the rival candidates, he set aside both and ordered a fresh election, in 1206. The choice fell on the Pope's candidate, Stephen Langton, an English theologian, who, though he had lived long in Rome, later proved himself a sincere patriot.

The Struggle between King and Pope. — John, beside himself with rage, refused to admit Stephen, seized much property of his clerical opponents, and forbade appeals to Rome. Thereupon, in 1208, the Pope laid the land under an interdict,[1] an impending blow which John sought to avert by vain bluster, threatening to drive all ecclesiastics out of the country and to tear out the eyes of the messengers from Rome. Many of the bishops found it safer to flee, leaving their property to be confiscated, and even the monks and lower clergy were, for a time at least, persecuted and pillaged. After a series of futile negotiations Innocent finally, in 1209, declared John excommunicated, though the sentence was only proclaimed in France, not in England.

John's Surrender to the Pope (1213). — With the King under the ban of the Church his subjects turned more and more against him, while John made matters worse by seizing the castles and hostages from those he suspected until he had almost as many enemies as he had barons. And it availed little that he succeeded, to some extent, in extending his royal power in Wales, Scotland, and Ireland. Then appeared a poor half-crazed hermit, Peter of Wakefield, prophesying

[1] By this the church doors were closed, the dead could only be buried in unconsecrated ground, and the performance of most of the rites of the Christian Church was withheld.

that by Ascension Day, 1213, John would be no longer King. With his prospects steadily darkening John felt it necessary to resume negotiations with the Pope. Innocent's terms were, in substance, that he should accept Langton as Archbishop, that he should restore all bishops, monks, and others, clerk or lay, who had been deprived during the late struggle and make them full compensation. The alternative was deposition, but John held off, until Innocent, to bring pressure upon him, authorized Philip of France to invade England and deprive him of his kingdom. John made frantic efforts to meet the threatened attack, but, finding that he could count on little support from his subjects, decided to yield, and, 13 May, 1213, met the papal legate, Pandulf, at Dover and accepted the hard terms. Two days later, on his own accord, he took the further step of surrendering his kingdom to the Pope; he received it back as a fief, did homage to Pandulf, and promised, for himself and his heirs, to pay an annual tribute of 1000 marks. Doubtless he felt that nothing else would check the threatened invasion and counteract the growing disaffection of the barons, and while his action has often been denounced as ignominious, it must be remembered that the state of vassalage was not, in those times, regarded as degrading. English Kings since the Conquest had held their continental possessions as fiefs of France, and even the lion-hearted Richard had agreed to yield all England in fief to the Emperor. It was the getting into the difficulty rather than the way he extricated himself that was most detrimental to King John, and, in some respects, to his successors: it furnished the Papacy with a precedent for interfering in disputed elections, while the ill-usage of the clergy alienated a class hitherto generally on the side of the Crown. Nevertheless his submission to Rome was a confession of defeat, and he had been forced to admit as Archbishop a man who shortly became the guiding spirit of the opposition. Still, Ascension Day passed safely, and poor Peter was hanged. Now that John was a vassal of the Holy See, Innocent prohibited Philip from waging war on him, while Langton, arriving in July, solemnly absolved him from his excommunication, though the interdict was not yet lifted, since the vacant benefices were still unfilled and the compensation due the clergy had yet to be settled.

III. The Opening of the Struggle with the Barons (1213). — John's efforts to revenge himself against Philip brought to an issue the third and final crisis of the reign. Directly after his submission, he began to prepare an expedition to Poitou. Most of the barons refused to follow, mainly on the ground that he was excommunicated, and when the ban was removed they took the ground that their tenures did not

bind them to serve abroad. While there seems to have been no legal ground for this latter contention, they had many and excessive causes of discontent; they got promises in plenty, but little else. There were the grievances purely feudal, some dating from the past, such as forcing heiresses into unequal marriages, extorting excessive reliefs, and abusing the right of wardships. Others bore on the non-feudal classes as well: taxes were excessive and arbitrary, while assessments on lands and movables increased in frequency and amount, and there were exactions from the Jews, and fines, some without a shadow of justice. Demands for foreign service were not unusual, though Henry II had usually provided mercenaries paid from the scutage. Three reasons led to the resistance under John. In the first place, his demands were more frequent. In the second place, men were alienated by his capriciousness and futility. In 1201, and again in 1205, he had levied men for foreign service and then dismissed them with a fine; in 1202–1203, he had failed to accomplish anything with the force he took abroad; moreover, the interest of Englishmen in foreign service was growing less and less. Additional discontent arose from the fact that John had allowed his royal baronial supporters to oppress the people, while, in spite of the recent reconciliation with the Papacy, the Church could not forget what it had suffered while the fight was raging. In short, England was suffering under "all the evil customs which the King's father and brother had raised up for the oppression of the Church and the realm, together with that which the King himself had added thereto."

The Winning of Magna Carta. — Such was the situation when John, gathering such forces as would follow him, started, February, 1214, to invade Poitou. After gaining a few momentary successes he was obliged to retreat before the French forces, since the Poitevin barons would not fight for him in the open field. While he was planning his next move his hopes were utterly dashed by the news that a great army, combined according to his plans under his nephew Otto, the German Emperor, had been met and defeated, 27 July, by Philip as it was hastening down to attack France on the northern border. John was obliged to make peace, 18 September, 1214, and, isolated and humiliated, he returned to England on the following month. Unmindful of his precarious situation he brought matters to an issue by demanding a scutage from the barons who had refused to accompany him to Poitou. Thereupon, the hardier spirits united, it is said, at St. Edmunds under pretense of a pilgrimage, demanded the confirmation of Henry I's Charter, and took an oath to wage war on the King in case he refused their terms. All through the winter the negotia-

tions went on. John put off a definite answer as long as he could and employed the interval in trying to circumvent his adversaries by various subterfuges; but all his twistings and doublings availed him nothing. The barons, when he finally rejected their terms, decided to wage war and renounced their allegiance, on the ground that the King had ceased to observe his feudal obligations, and marched down and occupied London. John, finding that almost no one but his mercenaries would stand by him and that Stephen Langton, really in sympathy with the baronial cause, would not excommunicate his enemies, was forced to yield. After some further parley the barons met him, 15 June, 1215, at Runnymede, where he set his seal to the Great Charter.

Magna Carta and Its Meaning. — The importance of Magna Carta is due rather to the use that was afterwards made of it by the champions of popular rights than to what was actually desired by the men who framed it. Actually it was secured by the barons primarily in the interests of their own order, to safeguard their feudal privileges against the encroachments of John and his royal predecessors; and many guarantees of popular government and popular liberty subsequently traced back to it are not to be found among its provisions. For example, it does not say that there shall be no taxation, except by the voice of the people, because Parliament, as the representative of all classes of the realm, did not yet exist. Moreover, the two most effective means by which the common man is protected against legal injustice to-day, trial by jury and *habeas corpus* — the latter a device to prevent holding a man in prison without cause shown — are not worked out in anything like their modern form. Another notable fact is that although five sixths of the population at that time were villeins whose chief grievances were at the hands of the manorial lords, very little is done for them. Certain great general principles were indeed embedded in the momentous document, namely that property shall not be taken from the subject for public use without compensation, that punishments shall not be cruel or unusual, that fines were not to be excessive, and that justice was to be open to all, freely and fairly administered; nevertheless, machinery had later to be devised to make these principles operative, and there were long stretches when they were practically forgotten.[1]

The Real Significance of Magna Carta. — In what then does its significance consist? Not so much in any of its particular provisions as in imposing restrictions upon royal absolutism, and in establishing the principle that Kings must observe the law, even though the law

[1] Shakespeare in his great drama *King John* does not mention Magna Carta at all.

which the barons had in mind was the feudal law, to which they and the King were the contracting parties. The principle of contract, or of reciprocal obligation definitely defined between the parties to an agreement, is an essentially feudal principle; and it is noteworthy that that dying feudalism left this priceless contribution to the cause of English liberty. While the barons led the movement primarily in their own interest, they united with them the Church, they kept the mass of freemen from supporting the Sovereign, and consequently, to some degree, undertook the business of these two classes as well as their own.

Summary of the Provisions Relating to Each of the Three Estates Separately. — The provisions of Magna Carta have been most conveniently grouped under two main heads: first, provisions relating to the rights and privileges of the three separate estates or political classes into which society was divided; secondly, provisions relating to these classes as a whole.

I. The following provisions relate to the Church, the barons, and the commons respectively. 1. The Church is to be free and to hold its rights entire and its liberties uninjured, particularly in the election of bishops. 2. The baronage are promised many concessions. Feudal abuses in the matter of reliefs, wardships, marriages, and the collection of debts shall be renounced. No scutage or aid beyond the three customary aids shall be imposed except by the Common Council of the tenant in chief. The same conditions which the King agrees to observe toward his immediate vassals shall be observed by them in dealing with their mesne or under-tenants. 3. Concessions to the commons[1] refer to all freemen or freeholders below baronial rank. Ancient liberties and free customs are guaranteed to London and other towns. The ancient rents of the counties were not to be increased. Merchants are to come in and go out of the kingdom, free from all evil tolls and by the ancient and rightful customs. All goods seized for the King's use are to be paid for.

II. **Summary of Provisions Relating to the Three Classes as a Whole.** — The provisions relating to the kingdom as a whole have mainly to do with judicial reforms, of which the two most celebrated provisions are those contained in clauses XXXIX and XL. The former provides that "no freeman shall be arrested, or detained in prison, or deprived of his freehold, or outlawed, or banished, or in any way molested, and we will not set forth against him, nor send against him, unless by the lawful judgment of his peers and by the law of the land." It is gen-

[1] On the Continent the term was restricted to the members of organized civic communities.

erally thought by modern scholars that the provision concerning judgment of peers was introduced by the barons to secure their exemption from accountability to the King's judges. This has survived in the right of peers in certain cases to be tried by the law of the land, hence it was reactionary rather than progressive; nor does the clause guarantee trial by jury, for the law of the land at that time recognized forms of trial other than and quite different from jury trial. Clause XL declares: "to no one will we sell, to no one will we deny or delay right or justice"; but was centuries before the writ of *habeas corpus*, which was to make this clause fully operative, was developed. Nevertheless, the germ of great principles is to be found in this and the preceding provisions.

Means of Enforcement and Future Importance of Magna Carta. — To insure the enforcement of the terms of the Charter a committee of twenty-four barons and the Lord Mayor of London was appointed, who were authorized to levy war on the King until any transgression of which he may have been guilty should have been amended. This machinery for securing its observance was the weakest thing about Magna Carta, for there could be no peaceful progress under any such arrangement; indeed, it was soon given up, and in due course of time the maintenance of the Charter's great principles was intrusted to Parliament.

Such was Magna Carta: "in form a grant from the King to his people, in reality a treaty extorted from him by his barons, acting with the clergy and the commons." One great cause of its enduring significance is that it dealt with actual conditions, it aimed not so much to create new liberties and privileges as to define those already existent and to guard against their infraction. As a wise historian has said, the Great Charter is "not the foundation of English liberty but the first, clearest, and historically the most important enunciation in it" and "the maintenance of the Charter was henceforth the watchword of English liberty."

The Baronial War and the Death of John (1216). — Although, for the moment, steps were taken to carry out its provisions, John had made concessions which he could not afford and did not intend to keep. Moreover, certain of the extremists among the northern barons had refused to enter into the agreement at Runnymede and continued in arms. In August John prepared to renew the war, whereupon the barons made ready to depose him. The Pope who, since John's submission, was on his side, had already, before the sealing of the Charter, ordered the excommunication of the disturbers of the kingdom: now, in August, he issued a bull declaring the Charter null and

void on the ground that it had been extorted by force. Also, he suspended Stephen Langton for refusing to carry out his sentence of excommunication. The leaders of the baronial opposition thereupon took the extreme step of transferring their allegiance to Louis of France "begging him" to come and "pluck them out of the hand of the tyrant." This drove John into one of his spasms of energy, and during the winter of 1215–1216 he harried the land from the south of the Thames to the Scottish border. In spite of papal prohibition, Louis landed at Thanet, 21 May, while John, who had returned from the north, retreated before the invader to the borders of Wales where he remained inactive until the end of August, when he marched into the east midlands ravaging as he went. On 19 October, he died at Newark of an illness brought on partly by his recent exertion, partly by an excess of eating and drinking. No King of England has since borne his name, yet his very vices and incapacity precipitated the downfall of absolutism and the rise of constitutional liberty.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

Narrative. The most recent detailed account of the reign of John is Kate Norgate, *John Lackland* (1902). Other accounts may be found in Ramsay, G. B. Adams, and Davis.

For a discussion of the constitutional significance of the reign of John and Henry III, see G. B. Adams, "The Critical Period of English History," *American Historical Review*, July, 1900. This is developed in his *Origin of the English Constitution* (1902). Edward Jenks, "The Myth of Magna Carta," *Independent Review*, November, 1904, pp. 260–273, is stimulating but exaggerated. The standard work on Magna Carta is W. S. McKechnie's *Magna Carta: A Commentary* (1913). It contains an historical introduction, also the text of the Great Charter, both in Latin and in English translation, and an elaborate commentary on each clause. See also *Magna Carta Commemoration Essays* (1917). The text of Magna Carta may be found also in translation in Adams and Stephens, no. 29.

CHAPTER X

HENRY III. THE STRUGGLE OF THE BARONS TO MAINTAIN THE CHARTER, TO EXPEL FOREIGN INFLUENCE, AND TO CONTROL THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE KINGDOM. CONDITIONS AT THE CLOSE OF THE REIGN

Henry's Minority (1216–1227). — Less than two weeks after his father's death, Henry, a boy of nine, was crowned at Gloucester. Under a capable Regent the new reign opened with the brightest of prospects. The King's very youth and innocence were a source of strength, for the barons had risen not against the royal office but against an unpopular and oppressive King, and now that he was no more, most of them turned gladly from a foreign invader to a native ruler. Louis — against whom the papal legate proclaimed a crusade — was defeated and forced to leave the country. The fair prospects under which the new reign opened did not remain long unclouded. In 1219 the Regency ended with the death of William Marshall, a fine type of the medieval soldier-statesman, who had labored effectively to restore peace and good government, and it fell to Hubert de Burgh, a faithful Minister and leader of the loyal English party, to combat on the one hand such of the barons as were still unreconciled to the Crown, on the other, foreign favorites and military adventurers. After some futile risings the restless barons were for the time being suppressed, and, in 1224, the most aspiring of the leaders of John's mercenary troops was forced to leave the country.

However, Hubert had many other perplexing complications to face. In Gascony — a division of the ancient Aquitaine — the commons, although they preferred English to French rule, resented any interference with their municipal liberties, and while they were unwilling to spend money on defense, expected the English governors to protect them in their quarrels with the neighboring barons who were very turbulent. One governor after another threw up the office in despair. Moreover, the young Henry was burning to retrieve the French possessions which his father had yielded. After Hubert proclaimed him

of age, in 1227, he steadily lost control over his vain and unstable master. Thus, much against his will, he had to fit out an expedition which the King in person led, in 1230, to aid certain Norman barons who had risen in revolt. After an inglorious campaign, in which the English soldiers performed greater feats in deep drinking than in fighting, he returned home, in September, having accomplished nothing.

Beginning of Henry's Personal Rule (1232). — Instigated by a wily foreign counselor, Henry made Hubert the scapegoat for all his troubles and miscarriages, as well as for the bad state of the finances — due to his own extravagance and military vainglory — and dismissed him in 1232. The common people were loud in their sympathy and a courageous smith, who was ordered to fetter him, refused to touch one to whom the country owed so much. But part of Hubert's property was taken from him and he had to spend some years in captivity. For the next quarter of a century Henry's personal government was unhampered by any wise or effective control and was marked by favoritism for foreigners and inept caprice.

Increasing Abuses and Futile Opposition. — Henry's marriage to Eleanor of Provence, in 1236, brought swarms of foreigners to England including needy kinsmen to be provided for. Although more than one attempted the task, there seemed to be for many years no leader in England capable of withstanding these aliens. In addition, the country had to bear the burden of heavy papal exactions. At Henry's request the Pope, in 1237, sent a cardinal legate, who, it is said, during a four years' sojourn took away as much gold and silver as he left in the country, claiming besides for his master the right to fill three hundred livings with Italians, while the spiritless King declared: "I neither wish nor dare to oppose the lord Pope in anything." Truly "England was a like vineyard with a broken hedge so that all who went by could steal of her grapes." Finally, there arose as leader of a national clerical party one of the most notable men of the century — Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln, whose first achievements were in theology, science, and, what was most rare in those days, in Greek. After he became Bishop, late in life, he turned his attention to politics, striving to unite the Church and the baronage in the defense of their common liberties and in resistance to papal encroachment. Particularly did he set himself against foreign nominees to English livings, whom he described as intruders "who not only strive to tear off the fleece, but do not even know the features of their flock." But, wedded to the theory of the superiority of the Church over the State and a stanch advocate of clerical immunity, he proved not to be the man to lead most effectively the popular cause.

The Baronial Demand for Elected Ministers. — In April, 1243, after Henry had led a futile expedition to assist the Poitevin barons and the Gascon towns in a rising against the French King, he was obliged to consent to the incorporation of Poitou into the French dominions. The situation grew steadily darker. London became disaffected and another papal agent came to glean after his predecessor's harvest. The King fell into sore financial straits, and the barons, taking advantage of his needs, began to demand that Ministers be appointed of native birth and acceptable to the country. Soon they went further, and, in 1244, as one of the conditions of a money grant, stipulated that the Justiciar, the Chancellor, and the Treasurer should be chosen in the Great Council. It was some years before they were able to carry their point. Henry might yield to the Pope but he maintained a lofty attitude toward his subjects. Since they persisted attaching conditions, which he would not accept, to all money grants, all sorts of expedients were resorted to for supplying the royal necessities. Curiously, the barons were at length to find a leader among the very foreigners they were seeking to oppose.

Simon de Montfort Becomes Leader of the National Party. — Simon de Montfort was a Norman by birth who first came to England in 1229. Beginning as an adherent of the royal party, he married Henry's sister Eleanor, and, in 1248, was sent to rule Gascony on the express condition that he should enjoy full powers, including control of the Gascon revenue, for seven years. In the face of unrest, intrigue, and revolt he adopted such drastic methods in restoring order that he reaped a harvest of discontent, whereupon, yielding to bitter complaints, Henry, in spite of the Governor's protests, finally dismissed him. Whoever was at fault, the fact remains that on the eve of the great crisis of his reign, the King forced into the enemy's camp the most remarkable man of his generation, a man destined to become one of the most notable figures in English history.

The Baronial Opposition Comes to a Head (1254). — In 1254, two years after this event, Henry culminated his impolicy by an act of extravagant folly which brought to a focus all the forms of opposition which had been slowly converging against his internal misgovernment, his futile foreign policy, and his abject submission to papal exaction. He accepted for his second son Edmund the crown of Sicily, which the Pope had long been striving to wrest from the Imperial house of Hohenstaufen. Edmund never attained the Sicilian throne but the efforts which his father made in his behalf were none the less momentous. He pledged himself to provide an army and 140,000 marks, and applied to his Great Council for supplies to redeem his bond. They refused,

in 1255, and again in 1257, when Henry brought his little son before them, and sought to work on their sentiments. Everything combined to foster discontent. Rain, flood, bad harvests, cattle-murrain, and high prices were estranging the poor. In 1256 the Pope had added another exaction by demanding for the first time annates or first fruits — the first year's annual revenue from clergy newly inducted into benefices. Aside from the new grievances, old ones continued from the previous reign, for, although the charters had been frequently confirmed, their concessions had been disregarded. Many castles were in the hands of foreigners, sheriffs and itinerant judges were perverting justice and levying excessive fines, and the forest laws were unmitigated in their severity. The storm burst in 1258.

The Provisions of Oxford (1258). — On 28 April, 1258, a Great Council of magnates, reënforced by representative knights from the shires, assembled. When the King in the face of the gathering discontent ventured again to ask for money for the Sicilian campaign, the barons and knights in full armor, though they laid their swords aside, crowded into the royal presence chamber and presented their terms. They demanded the dismissal of all aliens and the appointment of a committee of twenty-four — half from the royal party, half from the baronial — to draw up a scheme of reform to present at the next meeting of the Great Council. The King was forced to assent. To an assembly which met in June at Oxford, known as the "Mad Parliament," the committee submitted, not only a list of grievances, but a plan of government by which all authority was to be transferred from the Crown to representative bodies of the baronage. Chief among them was a permanent committee of fifteen which was to have complete control of the administration to which the King's Ministers were to be answerable. Three times a year it was to meet with another committee of twelve chosen from the Great Council to transact the business formerly in the hands of the latter body. Other committees still were to undertake the work of financial and Church reform. Such were the Provisions of Oxford. Their merit was in putting a check on the absolutism of an unpatriotic and incompetent King; yet they are open to serious criticism in that they aimed to put in his place an oligarchy that would tend to become equally self-seeking and ineffective and would be far more likely to hamper the executive and to foment discord than to advance the welfare of the Kingdom.

Preparation for War (1263). — No sooner were the Provisions acknowledged than the baronial party split into two factions. One was led by Simon de Montfort who seems to have been honestly desirous of securing the interests of all classes. The other was selfishly

concerned with the interests of its own order. Simon secured a momentary ascendancy by attaching Prince Edward to his cause, and, in 1259, carried the passage of a series of measures known as the Provisions of Westminster, by which the powers and profits of the private feudal courts were greatly curtailed. For a time the King worked loyally with the new council; nevertheless, before many months, he shook himself free from the baronial shackles, he made an alliance with Louis IX, King of France, he drew the baronial faction opposing Simon to his side, he reconciled himself with Edward, and, finally, appealed to Pope Alexander IV to release him from his oath to observe the Provisions. This last request was granted by a bull, dated 13 April, 1261, which annulled the whole legislation of 1258–1259. With his hand thus strengthened, Henry returned to his old courses. The renewal of danger drew the two factions of the barons together again, and civil war broke out in 1263; but the opposing forces proved so evenly balanced that they decided to arbitrate and appealed to Louis IX to settle the points at issue. However, when the French King, in 1264, decided almost every question in favor of the Crown, Simon, whose chief following was now among the lesser folk, refused to be bound by the award.

Simon's Victory at Lewes (1264). His Famous Parliament (1265). — In the civil war which followed he was able to win a great victory over the royal forces, 14 May, 1264, at Lewes, as a result of which Henry was forced to agree to uphold the Great Charter, the Charter of the Forests, and the Provisions of Oxford, while Edward was to be a hostage for the good behavior of the "Marchers," or men of the Welsh border who were bitterly hostile to the baronial leader for having called in the Welsh as allies. During the period of his triumph de Montfort had the King issue writs, summoning a notable assembly which sat from January to March, 1265. This has often been spoken of as the first Parliament in English history, because it was the first body in which both knights of the shire and representatives from the towns sat with the Great Council, but it was a partisan body and far from being completely representative in other respects. De Montfort's Parliament, however, is not without constitutional significance as a stage in the development from the Great Council to the institution which came to represent the three estates of the realm. More than once, already, knights from the shires had sat with the barons, but never before had they been reënforced by representatives from the towns.

Defeat and Death of Simon (1265). His Character and Work. — In April, 1265, war broke out again, the standard of revolt being

raised by the Marchers, whereupon discontented members of Simon's party and old royal adherents flocked to the western country. Prince Edward, who had escaped from his keepers while hunting, soon appeared as leader and, 4 August, he succeeded in entrapping the baronial army at Evesham, on a narrow tongue of land formed by an abrupt bend of the Stratford Avon, where Simon fell bravely fighting. By the victory of Evesham and the death of Simon the royal party was again triumphant. "Sir Simon the righteous" was not a hero without blemish; he started life as an adventurer, nor did he begin his opposition as a disinterested advocate of popular liberty, but because of quarrels with Henry, culminating in the Gascon affair. Even after he put himself at the head of the national party he was at times shifty and cruel, and always masterful and impatient of restraint; yet whether from interest or conviction, he threw himself on the support of the people, worked sincerely for their interests, and secured them a more complete representation in the National Council than they had ever enjoyed. Consequently they adored their departed leader as a saint, and miracles were worked at his tomb.

Final Submission of the Barons (1267). Results of the Struggle. — A fragment of the barons held out stubbornly at Kenilworth until December of 1266 when disease and famine compelled them to surrender. By way of concession the reënactment of the Charters was promised, as well as the redress of some of the grievances mentioned in the Provisions of 1258 and 1259, but another revolt had to be faced, and some minor risings had to be put down before the country was really at peace. The barons had failed to secure the supremacy at which they aimed and it was well for England that they did; but they had broken the power of absolutism, they had aroused and kept alive the national opposition against foreign favorites, they had made the Charters a reality, they had taken steps to make the Great Council a popular representative body. The result of their work was to manifest itself in the next reign and to live in time to come.

Death of Henry (1272). — While his sons, Edward and Edmund, were away on a crusade Henry died, 16 November, 1272 in his sixty-sixth year. Personally he had many commendable qualities. His private life was blameless, he was religious, he had a refined mind and cultivated tastes. A generous patron of art, his most enduring monument is Westminster Abbey, the foundation of Edward the Confessor which he caused to be rebuilt. As to his faults they are manifest in the history of his reign; he lacked moral courage, he was timid, evasive, weak, and obstinate. Worst of all he had no talent for administration or grasp of politics, and was quite un-English in feeling.

England and the Intellectual and Religious Movements of the Time. — One good side there was to the un-English policy of Henry III, it helped to open the country to the best fruits of Continental civilization. By a strange contradiction the period, in spite of maladministration and turbulence, was one of high achievement in art, in religious revival, and intellectual progress. In England, as elsewhere, two antagonistic tendencies were at work: politically there was a tendency to accentuate national differences, which ran counter to the other great tendency of the Middle Ages, that toward unity or universality. The Catholic Church with the Pope at the head was the church of all Christendom, its clergy, its monks, and friars were subjects of no country, but citizens of heaven — as they sometimes pleased to call themselves. The academic system was a universal one, famous scholars were equally at home in England, France, and Italy, while Latin was the language of the learned in every Christian land. The Crusades, too, offered a common enterprise which brought together men without distinction of boundary. The friar, the knight-errant, the scholar, and the merchant tended to maintain and foster a union which a growing sense of nationality threatened to break.

The Franciscan and Dominican Friars. — Perhaps the most potent factor in the revised intellectual and religious life of the age is to be found in the new orders — the friars. Two of these orders of brothers (Latin *fratres*) came into being at about the same time, and they supplemented each other. That of the Spanish St. Dominic was strong in organization and the defense of orthodoxy, that of the Italian, St. Francis, in spiritual impulse and ideals of pure living. Shortly before Henry III of England was born, a young merchant of the little town of Assisi felt prompted by a divine voice to renounce his past life and to devote himself to the service of God and his fellow man. In one direction particularly there was an abundant field: the towns had scant regard for the poor who lived on their outskirts; the parish priest proved unequal to the situation, while the monk was a recluse and fled from the crowded haunts of men. St. Francis, for so he came to be known, taking literally the words of Christ: "provide neither gold nor silver . . . in your purses, neither scrip for your journey," renounced his worldly prospects and went forth to teach and preach and minister to the simple and needy. After some years he went to Rome, hatless and barefoot, and obtained from Innocent III permission to establish a rule of life from which grew his famous order of mendicant friars — formally recognized in 1223. In three respects the Franciscans grew away from the original intention of their founder: he started with the idea of wandering missionaries, with no formal

organization, who should not concern themselves with theology; however, even in his own lifetime they came to center chiefly in cities, they were constituted into a regular order, and as time went on, they became famous for their learned scholars. Meantime, in southern France, the son of a noble Castilian house, trained in the best academic traditions of the day, was devoting his rare talents and pitiless zeal to combating heresy and schism. This was the redoubtable St. Dominic who founded the order of preaching friars which adopted the Franciscan principle of poverty, and was formally recognized in 1220.

The Coming of the Friars to England. — In 1221 a band of thirteen Dominicans landed in England. Establishing themselves in London, they proceeded to Oxford, where they set up schools and gathered disciples about them whom they trained as preachers. The Dominicans were followed two years later by a small group of nine Franciscans, who grew and spread until within five years they were domiciled in almost every considerable town in England; but their houses were held for them in trust, for they could possess no property. Settling down outside the city walls, among the destitute and lowly, they taught and ministered with heroic devotion, preaching to the people in a homely style and spicing their sermons with merry jests and tales. What with their humor and their zeal they gained a wonderful hold wherever they went. Moreover, the English Franciscans produced some of the most famous scholars of the age.[1] As time went on, however, so many unworthy recruits entered the ranks that by Chaucer's day friars had come to be generally regarded as beggarly rogues.

The Parish Priest. — The earlier friars, as well as doing their peculiar work in the towns and the universities, acted as evangelists conducting revivals in the rural districts. Nevertheless, the parish church was still the center of village life, though the gilds, too, had a very marked religious aspect, for they provided masses for the souls of deceased members and had their patron saints and funds for charity. The parish priests were simple men of very scanty learning, with just enough Latin to say mass. They were forbidden to accept any secular office, such as that of steward or bailiff, or any judicial function involving power to inflict capital punishment, and were also prohibited from dressing in military fashion or from taking part in "scot ales" or public feasts where there were competitions in drinking. While there were frequent complaints of ignorance, of negligence in teaching and in visiting the sick, of hurrying through the service, and of too frequent absence from the parish, some performed their duties excellently and many others did their best according to their lights. Riotous

[1] The most famous Dominican scholars were not Englishmen.

sports, gluttony, and heavy drinking were among the chief offenses of the laity.

The Popular Religion. — The religion of the age was very real. The people, though rude and boisterous, were simple and childlike and ready to atone for their sins by crusades and pilgrimages, by contributing to the building of churches and monasteries, and by gifts at shrines and altars. Anchorites, living in caves and on the banks of lonely streams, were visited by pilgrims marveling at their faith and holiness. Worship was chiefly a matter of outward form. Though the people were generally instructed in the creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the ten commandments, they blindly worshiped images and relics and sought to approach God mainly through the medium of the saints. Belief in witchcraft, charms, and spells was practically universal. Some of their superstitions were very touching and pretty. A story is told of the appearance, one harvest time in East Anglia "no man knew whence," of a boy and girl "completely green in their person and clad in garments of strange color and unknown materials." These strange visitors were most kindly welcomed, baptized into the fellowship of the Church, and cherished, "till at length they changed their natural color through the natural effect of our food."

The Universities. — At the beginning of Henry's reign the two essentials of a university were the masters and the scholars, who might migrate wherever they would. A great step in advance was taken when men began to found colleges, or houses with a master and scholars or fellows, with the object of providing shelter for poor students and of encouraging systematic study. John Balliol's foundation at Oxford, in 1260, was hardly more than an almshouse for needy scholars; but Walter de Merton's, three years later, was well organized and furnished a model for subsequent college benefactors. The universities were far from being centers of secluded calm, for we hear of frequent riots among the students; moreover, they exercised a profound and active influence on the politics and government of the time, and produced men who took prominent places at court or on the episcopal bench. Grosseteste and Adam Marsh, lecturers to the Franciscans, were famous scholars, but their fame has been eclipsed by that of Roger Bacon (1214–1294). The prevailing interest of the learned had been, since the eleventh century, to elaborate the great philosophical, theological system known as Scholasticism, the aim of which was to defend the authority of the Church by weapons of logic supplied by Aristotle. There were two schools, the Realists who asserted that general ideas, "Universals" as they called them, alone were real; opposed to them were the Nominalists insisting that they had no real

existence but were only names. The dominant method of the Schoolmen was deductive, that is they proceeded from general principles to particular cases. Bacon, who mastered all the scientific learning of the time and who knew Greek and Hebrew as well, sought to introduce the experimental or inductive method by which general principles are discovered or framed from particular facts. Unfortunately he was ahead of his time, he was suspected of being a heretic and magician, and spent years of his life in exile and confinement. Although the age was a learned one, the tendency was toward formalism and speculative philosophy rather than toward elegant culture, broad human interests, and graceful literary expression.

Literature and Language. — In this period the only historian to compare with William of Malmesbury and William of Newburgh was Matthew Paris, who set himself not only to record events but to comment on their significance and to discuss the motives and character of the men who took part in them. Furthermore, his knowledge was not confined to purely English affairs, but included those of the Continent as well. The chronicles were of course written in Latin which was still the language of the learned. French remained the elegant language of the Court and upper classes, and of the romances by which they were diverted. It was used, too, in pleadings in the law courts and in the debates in the Great Council. However, because of the growing national sentiment, English, the tongue of the yeoman and the lower classes, was steadily developing as a vehicle of literary expression. There are a few fine poetic pieces, while, in village alehouses and fairs, strolling minstrels sang of the early heroes, Arthur and Merlin, Alexander and Charlemagne.

Architecture. — "Architecture, the great art of the Middle Ages, was in its perfection" in this reign. The transition from the Norman to the early English style with its delicate spires and pointed arches was complete by the reign of John and under his successor the latter style reached its maturity. King Henry's chief architectural interest was in the rebuilding of Westminster Abbey, though, curiously enough, this national monument is French rather than English both in structure and in decoration. Very few castles were built in this period except along the frontier districts facing the Welsh border, and although increasing attempts were made to render them habitable by the addition of fireplaces and other comforts, the fortified manor houses were being more and more preferred as dwellings for the great, while the poor folk still lived in simple wooden houses.

Foreign Trade. — Merchants, except during the intervals of war with France, were allowed to come and go freely. English staples

were mainly agricultural, grain, flesh, and dairy produce. Such surplus as was raised was sold at local markets and fairs. Wool, woolfells, and hides had come to be the chief articles of export, along with tin, lead, and iron. The crusaders had given a great impulse to intercourse with the East, and the great nobles, lay and clerical, imported fine cloths, silks, furs, and jewels, wax, spices, and wines. While the best cloth came from the looms of Flanders and the north of France, where most of the English wool found a market, the Rhine cities supplemented the Gascon ports as sources for the wine supply, and the Hanseatic League controlled the Baltic trade and brought in furs, tar, and fish. The Italian cities were for two centuries to come the chief carriers for the Oriental traffic. Although the foreign trade was mainly in the hands of foreign merchants, English shipping was steadily increasing. The Cinque Ports[1] were coming into importance and securing peculiar privileges because of the ships which they furnished for the royal navy; as a matter of fact they were still little better than "nests of chartered sea robbers" and many complaints were brought against them on this score; but they rendered indispensable service on more than one occasion. Henry's reign is notable in many ways as a stage in the progress of maritime affairs; for example, licenses to privateers were first issued, and the magnet began to be used.

Internal Trade. Markets and Fairs.—The danger and difficulty of traveling, as well as the innumerable and vexatious charges for tolls and ferries, hampered internal trade. There were some good roads, the survival of Roman times, particularly that from Dover to London; but many were almost impassable during certain seasons in the year, and off the beaten path the country was infested by robbers. Outside the local markets and the towns, trading centered in the great annual fairs, the most famous of which were at Stourbridge and Winchester. The Stourbridge fair — opening annually 18 September for three weeks — controlled the trade of the eastern counties and the Baltic Sea, though every trade and nationality was represented. More important still was the Winchester fair. Lying between Southampton and London it was the great mart for the southeast, and opened every year on the eve of St. Giles (31 August) for sixteen days. During the session of the fair, all trade was suspended in the neighborhood and weights and measures were carefully scrutinized; in return for privileges and protection the merchants paid heavy toll to the lords who controlled the fairs.

[1] Originally five port towns in Sussex and Kent (Hastings, Rommey, Hythe, Dover, and Sandwich) to which two were subsequently added.

Native Industries, Towns, and Gilds. — The progress of the native industries was not as yet very great. Agriculture, fishing, and mining were the chief pursuits. Such cloth as was manufactured went to supply the needs of the household, except in certain towns where the Flemish weavers, dyers, and fullers were established. Each village had its own tanner and bootmaker, smith, carpenter, and miller, and usually a professional hunter of wolves, cats, and otters, and moles whose skins were mainly used for hats. The towns, however, were developing steadily, even the smaller ones were no longer the homes of agriculturists but contained flourishing organizations of trade and handicraftsmen. A very pronounced feature was the division of labor. For instance, in connection with the production and distribution of each of the staple commodities, wood and leather, we find ten or a dozen separate gilds or companies, each with its special quarters or market. Houses were arranged with the dwelling rooms at the top, the workshop below, while the goods were exposed for sale under the overhanging porch on the edge of the street. The gilds were exercising an increasing influence on the town government, for their members occupied the most important offices, and municipal affairs were regulated in their interests.

Rural Life. — After all, however, England was still mainly an agricultural country. The long vacations of the universities and the law courts are a survival of this time when the students and the practitioners were needed at home to work on the harvest. All evidences point to a quiet steady improvement of conditions. Landlords devoted more and more personal attention to their estates. Though the tenant farmer had appeared, he as yet played little part in rural economy. The status of the cultivator continued to improve and, more and more, serfs became free agricultural laborers. The clergy, however, were constantly preaching to the tillers of the soil to remain where God had placed them, comparing the ambitious to the worm that thought it had wings or the rat who wished to marry the sun's daughter. Owing to the faulty communications which made it necessary for each district to be so far as possible self-sufficing, the wasteful system of mixed farming persisted. Wheat, rye, and stock were all raised together without regard to the fitness of the special locality for one or the other, except in certain parts of Yorkshire where the Cistercians devoted themselves to wool growing. Because of the difficulty of transportation, the lords and even the kings wandered about from manor to manor to consume the supplies belonging to them. Some magnates had as many as ten or eleven estates scattered over different counties, each with a bailiff to keep its accounts and under

the general supervision of a steward whose duties were mainly legal. It was still practically impossible to keep any considerable amount of stock over the winter. Aside from a heavy famine, during the years 1257–1259, the period was, in general, one of plenty and prosperity.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

Narrative. Davis; Sir J. H. Ramsay, *The Dawn of the Constitution* (1908); and T. F. Tout, *Political History of England* (1905), an interesting and scholarly account of the period from the accession of Henry III to the death of Edward I. Stubbs, *Early Plantagenets* (1886), owing to its grouping of topics, gives perhaps the best brief account of the reign of Henry III. Kate Norgate, *The Minority of Henry III* (1912) is the fullest and most recent narrative of the early years of Henry III.

Constitutional and Legal. Taylor; A. B. White; Taswell-Langmead; Stubbs, *Constitutional History;* Pollock and Maitland.

Social, industrial, and intellectual conditions. Traill; Bateson; Davis; Moody and Lovett; Taine; *Cambridge History of Literature;* Jusserand; and A. G. Little, *Roger Bacon* (1914).

Biography. G. W. Prothero, *Simon de Montfort* (1877); F. S. Stevenson, *Robert Grosseteste* (1899), "the most complete life of Grosseteste"; M. Creighton, *Historical Lectures and Addresses* (1903), three brief excellent lectures on Grosseteste and his times.

The Church. Wakeman; Stephens; also F. A. Gasquet, *Henry III and the English Church* (1905), from the Roman Catholic standpoint; and A. Jessopp, *The Coming of the Friars* (1890).

Selections from the sources, Adams and Stephens, nos. 30–36.

CHAPTER XI

EDWARD I AND EDWARD II (1272–1327). THE COMPLETION OF THE FOUNDATIONS OF THE ENGLISH CONSTITUTIONAL SYSTEM

Edward I (1272–1307), Accession and Early Life. — Henry III had been dead for nearly two years before Edward I returned from the Holy Land, in the prime of his young manhood. The son of the pettiest of the Angevins and of a foreign mother, he seemed far from fitted to lead a people whose national and patriotic aspirations were rapidly awakening. Nor did his childhood or early youth promise much. At fifteen he was married to a foreign princess, Eleanor of Castile, and jousts, tournaments, and the pleasures of the chase caused him for a time to neglect graver occupations. The baronial revolt, however, brought him for a season under the influence of de Montfort: although his royal instincts and his affection for his father soon drew him from the ranks of revolt, he had learned lessons in military and political affairs which deeply influenced his future, and he came to be recognized as the first truly English King since the Norman Conquest.

Personal Traits. — Yet, in spite of his ancestry and some unpromising signs in his youth, Edward was well qualified both in mind and body to become the representative of English hopes. His fair hair and ruddy cheeks were typically Anglo-Saxon. So tall that he got the name of "Long-shanks," his commanding presence, united to skill in chivalrous exercises and military ability, were bound to impress the medieval Englishman. While prompt to resist encroachments of the Church or the Papacy, he was genuinely religious; he was devout in visiting shrines, he made vows in time of stress, and when delivered from danger and difficulty never failed to offer public thanks. Though he prided himself on his truthfulness, adopting as his motto, *Pactum serva* ("keep troth"), yet he was not above legal evasions when he kept the letter of his agreement at the expense of the spirit

The Subjugation of Wales (1277–1282). — The first serious problem that the King had to face was the conquest of Wales. The Celtic peoples occupying the strip of coast to the north and south of the

peninsula now known as Wales had been isolated from their kinsmen and had been conquered and absorbed before the Conquest, and the Normans had set up earldoms to protect the Marches, or border, from the fierce mountaineers who remained unsubdued. During the reigns of John and Henry III, Llywelyn, and his grandson of the same name, succeeded in extending their authority over all Wales. The older Llywelyn by making common cause with the barons against John secured important concessions in Magna Carta. The younger, in alliance with Simon de Montfort, took an active part against Henry III during the Barons' war, at the close of which the English King granted him extremely liberal terms; in return for homage and an indemnity he was to be recognized as Prince of Wales and immediate lord of all the Welsh chieftains outside the limits of the Marches. However, when Edward came to the throne, Llywelyn refused to perform homage or to pay indemnity. A succession of invasions and more than five years of intermittent fighting were required — during which time the unscrupulousness and brutality of English administrative officials did much to keep resistance aflame — before the defeat and death in battle of Llywelyn, 1282, enabled the English King to complete the conquest of Wales.

The Statute of Wales or Rhuddlan (1284). — In 1284 the Statute of Wales was issued at Rhuddlan to provide for governing the recent acquisitions, which were secured by fortresses. Wales was formally annexed to the English dominions and the English shire system was extended by the creation of four shires in the north and by the reorganization of two already established in the south. English law administered by English sheriffs was introduced, though, wherever possible, Welsh local customs were allowed to stand. In 1301 the title of Prince of Wales was conferred on Edward's oldest surviving son, born at Carnarvon in 1284. This has been the customary title of the heir apparent to the throne ever since.

The French and Scotch Wars and Their Consequences. — Within a few years Edward involved himself in Scotch complications that, combined with a French war which followed, led to most significant consequences. Henceforth, English Kings were constantly interfering in Scotch affairs, a policy which threw Scotland into the arms of France and established a close association between the two countries, with a consequent French influence on Scotch manners and customs that left enduring marks. Also French intrigue so accentuated the natural hostility of the Scots that — to say nothing of persistent plundering raids — England had to reckon with her northern neighbors in every crisis, foreign and domestic, during the next four cen-

SHETLAND ISLANDS (Same scale)
ORKNEY ISLANDS
SUTHERLAND
CAITHNESS
Moray Firth
Inverness
BUCHAN
Aberdeen
R. Dee
ATHOL
Brechin
ANGUS
Dundee
Dunkeld
Perth
Scone
Firth of Tay
St. Andrews
STRATHEARN
Cambuskenneth
Firth of Forth
R. Forth
Stirling
Bannockburn
Falkirk
Edinburgh
Dunbar
LOTHIAN
Berwick
Norham
Glasgow
STRATHCLYDE
R. Clyde
Firth of Clyde
Solway Firth
Carlisle
Melrose
R. Tweed
TEVIOTDALE
ANNANDALE
KYLE
CANTIRE
ARRAN
ISLAY
JURA
IONA
MULL
Firth of Lorn
LORN
ARGYLE
ATLANTIC OCEAN
NORTH SEA
ENGLAND
SCOTLAND
REIGN OF EDWARD I
SCALE OF ENGLISH MILES
0 10 20 40 60
Longitude West from Greenwich
BORMAY & CO., ENGR'S, N.Y.

turies. Finally, the wars against the Scots and French forced Edward to make demands of money and service from his subjects which resulted in their securing from him constitutional concessions of great and enduring value.

The Disputed Succession in Scotland. — The country ruled by the Scotch Kings in the thirteenth century was composed of many diverse elements. Although the Highlands and the royal race were Celtic, the Lowlands, forming the richest and most populous part of the realm, were inhabited by people of English blood with English institutions and bound to England by close feudal ties. Ever since the time of Edward the Elder, English Kings had claimed a shadowy overlordship over the Scots; but its extent and character had never been clearly determined. Suddenly, in 1286, Alexander III, the reigning King, was killed by his horse falling, leaving as his only direct heir a little granddaughter, who died in 1290. In 1291 Edward ordered the Scottish barons and clergy to meet him, and announced his intention, as Superior and Lord Paramount, to settle the succession. There were no less than twelve claimants, of whom the two leading ones were John Balliol and Robert Bruce. The law of the case was referred to a body of commissioners, and as a result of their findings Edward pronounced in favor of Balliol, who swearing fealty to him was crowned in 1292 at Scone.

The Conquest of Scotland (1296). The Deposition of John Balliol. — Edward had intervened in the interests of order, and he observed the law, as declared by the commissioners, in his award. At the same time he took advantage of the situation to press his claims to overlordship, and in pursuance of this policy demanded that English courts should decide cases which were appealed from the courts of Scotland. Balliol sought to evade this requirement, contracted, in 1295, an alliance with France, sent an expedition across the Border, and ended, in 1296, by renouncing his allegiance. Thereupon, Edward invaded Scotland, took Balliol prisoner, and forced him to renounce his claim to the kingship. Though far from harsh, many of Edward's measures galled the already irritated pride of the Scots. He made a triumphal march through the country, he declared the Kingdom forfeited, placed most of the great offices of State in English hands, and carried off the ancient coronation stone of Scone to Westminster Abbey where it has remained ever since.

The War with France (1293). — A breach with France, beginning in 1293, arose out of quarrels between English and French sailors due to bitter commercial rivalry, and the wily Philip IV, now King of France, seized the pretext to pronounce the forfeiture of Edward's Gascon

possessions, a step which led the English King to declare war in June, 1294. In order to meet the Franco-Scottish alliance, concluded the following year, he took the decisive step of appealing to the whole body of his subjects by summoning, in November, the Model Parliament, which marks the culmination of the growth of English representative government and perhaps the most important stage of its history.

The Beginnings of Parliament to 1265. — The term "Parliament" means literally a speaking or conferring, and came to be applied to the body in which the speaking took place, a general council of the realm, summoned by the King, to consult on the affairs of the realm and to transact its business, to vote taxes, to enact and repeal laws. Matthew Paris first employed the name in connection with an assembly of the Magnates, in 1246, though that particular body was no more representative or elective than the Witan or the Great Council. The origin of the representative element may be traced to the juries first employed regularly under Henry II to bring criminals to justice, to decide suits at law, and to assess taxes, and who, during the time of Richard's able Minister, Hubert Walter, came to be more and more elective in character. As the lesser nobility came to count for less in the Great Council they began to identify themselves with the landed gentry and to serve on juries transacting local business. In the course of the conflicts under John and Henry III, sometimes the Crown and sometimes the barons called these local representatives to meet with the Great Council until gradually they came to form a part of the regular machinery of central government. In 1213 it is recorded that representatives from certain towns were summoned to meet at St. Albans in August, while, in November, four discreet knights of each shire were called to Oxford "to confer with the King on the affairs of the kingdom"; but it is uncertain whether the local representatives appeared at either place, and taxes continued for many years to be voted in councils of great tenants-in-chief and assessed and collected in the separate shires by representative knights. The first clear case of a central assembly of representative knights came in 1254, when, upon the refusal of the bishops and barons to vote supplies during a Gascon campaign, two knights from each shire were summoned through the sheriff to declare what the electors were willing to grant.

The Growth of Parliament from 1265 to 1295. — The next step was taken in 1265 when Simon de Montfort summoned to his Parliament not only two knights from each shire, but also two citizens or burgesses from each of twenty-one cities and boroughs which he selected. This has often been called the first English Parliament; but, while Simon

deserves credit for first bringing together the two elements that make up the later House of Commons, his was not a completely representative body. It consisted exclusively of his own supporters, the lower clergy were not summoned at all; only the barons of his following were present, and, in the case of the towns, the writs were directed to such mayors as were on his side, and not, as came to be the case later, to the sheriffs of the shires in which the towns were situated. All one can say is that the Parliament of 1265 represented more classes than any which had met up to that time. While, moreover, in all the Parliaments summoned during the next thirty years, some one of the three estates — nobles, clergy, commons — were either absent or incompletely represented, nevertheless, Simon de Montfort deserves credit for initiating a very important step in parliamentary progress.

The Model Parliament (1295). — Edward's Parliament of 1295 was the first to represent all classes. Here were present representatives from the nobility, earls, and barons; from the clergy, archbishops and bishops, abbots, priors, heads of the military religious orders, deans of cathedrals, and proctors or delegates from the various chapters and dioceses; from the commons, two knights from each shire and representatives from more than a hundred cities and boroughs. In spite of a reference in the writ of summons to the "most righteous law . . . that what touches all shall be approved by all," Edward was more interested in getting money for his wars with France and Scotland than in perfecting the constitution of Parliament. While some incomplete assemblies met after 1295, the assembly of that year furnished the model for time to come. It was the work of the next century to determine how the estates now represented should arrange themselves. The lower clergy soon dropped out and transacted their business in representative bodies of their own, known as Convocations, of which there were two, one under Canterbury and one under York, each divided into two houses, an upper and a lower. The higher clergy had seats both in the upper house of Convocation and in Parliament. In the latter body they soon came — in 1332 — to be organized, together with the temporal peers, into the House of Lords, while the knights of the shire and the representatives of the cities and boroughs united to form the House of Commons.[1]

The Opposition of the Clergy, the Barons, and the Merchants

[1] However, it was a long time before the Commons came to appreciate their privilege, and for various reasons: it was a hard and expensive journey to Westminster; they were usually called only to vote supplies, at first counting for little in the deliberations of the prelates and nobles; and local centers had to pay the salaries of such representatives as they sent.

(1296). — From the money granted by the Model Parliament Edward was able to conquer Scotland in 1296, but an expedition to Gascony led by his brother Edmund was a dismal failure. While the barons, knights, and burgesses, assembled in a new Parliament, November, 1296, made liberal grants for another campaign against Philip the Fair, the clergy took their stand on a bull known as *Clericis laicos* recently issued by Boniface VIII, which forbade the lay authorities, under pain of excommunication, to collect taxes from the clergy without the Pope's consent. Edward replied by putting them outside the protection of the law so that any man might plunder them at will, and all lay fiefs of clerks in the see of Canterbury who refused to pay were seized by royal order. Increased necessity soon forced Edward into conflict with both the barons and the merchants. In a stormy baronial assembly, the former, led by the Marshal, the Earl of Norfolk, and the Constable, the Earl of Hereford, refused to serve in Gascony unless the King commanded in person, and collected men at arms to support their resistance. The King embittered the merchants by seizing a portion of their wool and subjecting the remainder to a heavy tax. Disaffection was further spread by requisitions for grain and salt throughout the Kingdom.

Edward's Expedition to Flanders. Wallace's Rising in Scotland (1297). — Edward's courage and resource and the loyalty of his subjects in the face of danger enabled him to tide over the crisis. The clergy grudgingly yielded their quota; the merchants were satisfied with a promise that they would be compensated for their wool when peace was restored; while the King paid for his requisitions and agreed to pay for the services of all who would respond to his "affectionate request." Leaving Prince Edward as Regent, he departed for Flanders in the summer of 1297 with a goodly following. Though the Gascon expedition was dropped, Norfolk and Hereford resigned their offices and held sullenly aloof. Meantime, a formidable rising broke out in Scotland headed by Sir William Wallace, one of the Lowland knights. Edward refused to be diverted from Flanders, though he sent some of his best warriors to the North; but the English forces were overcome at the Battle of Stirling Bridge, 11 September, and Scotland passed for the moment out of English hands.

The Confirmation of the Charters (1297). — After Edward's departure for Flanders, those barons who still remained disaffected took advantage of the Scotch crisis to renew their demands. Coming to Parliament armed, they threatened to vote no more supplies and, 12 October, the Regency was forced to give way. The concessions were embodied in a famous document known as the *Confirmatio Cartarum*,

providing that the Charter of Liberties and the Forests should be confirmed, that the King's recent exactions should not be made precedents, and, most important of all, it was enacted that, "no aids, tasks or prises were to be taken, but by the common consent of the realm and for the common profit thereof, saving the ancient aids and prises due and accustomed."[1] The *Confirmatio* was ratified by the King at Ghent. By specifying "aids, tasks, and prises" the barons sought to cover all forms of taxes known to them, and the King recognized the principle that no new or extraordinary taxes should be levied without the consent of Parliament. At least twice afterwards Edward evaded the spirit of his concessions; moreover, in 1305, he secured from the Pope a solemn absolution from the engagement of 1297. Yet, in spite of all wriggling, a principle had been formulated and recognized which was to influence profoundly the course of English constitutional history.

Peace with France (1299). Defeat and Execution of Wallace (1305). — Edward accomplished little in Flanders, and, as Philip IV was not anxious to continue fighting, a peace was arranged in 1297 — concluded in 1299 — by which each party was to retain what he had at the beginning of the war. Thus the English King was free to take the field against the Scots, and, 22 July, 1298, met and defeated the forces of Wallace at Falkirk. In spite of his victory, Edward, owing to desertions, and the scarcity of provisions, had to march south in the early winter of 1299, leaving southern Scotland still unconquered. Two campaigns, in 1300 and 1301, were equally inconclusive, indeed, it was not till 1304 that Edward was able to strike a decisive blow. William Wallace, who held out after the bulk of his countrymen had submitted, was betrayed by a Scot in the King's service, was taken to London, and executed.

Robert Bruce. Edward's Last Campaign against the Scots (1307). — In spite of wise laws which Edward framed for them, the Scots remained unreconciled. A leader arose in Robert Bruce, the grandson of Balliol's old rival, who was crowned at Scone, 25 March, 1306.[2] Edward, regardless of the infirmities of age, hastily made preparation and started north; but died, 7 July, 1307, before he reached the Border. The approach of death did not diminish his hatred toward his opponents. By his order, *Edwardus Primus, Scotorum Malleus, Pactum Serva*, was inscribed on his tomb, while he further ordered

[1] The *Statutum De Tallagio non concedendo*, formerly accepted as a statute, was probably a preliminary draft of the baronial demands.

[2] Every one has heard how in one of his discouraging moments when he was a fugitive in the lonely wastes a spider taught him patience.

that his bones should be carried with the army whenever the Scots rebelled, and only buried after their defeat. His was a noble idea to unite the various races of Britain into a single nation; but to seek to carry it out in the teeth of such intense opposition was criminal folly and involved England and Scotland in untold losses of men and money. Elsewhere, beyond the English borders, Edward's management of affairs was not unsuccessful. He had reduced Wales; to Ireland, in spite of bristling difficulties, he was able to give a fairly satisfactory rule; also he frustrated Philip's attempt to seize Gascony, and administered the country with few complaints from either barons or commons.

His Work as Administrative Organizer and Lawgiver. — It was as an administrative organizer and lawgiver that Edward did his most enduring work. His task was to resume what Henry II had begun, to preserve what was best and adapt it to new conditions, to accept at the same time the most beneficial and necessary of the reforms which had been forced on the Crown under John and Henry III, and to fuse the old and the new into the structure of the Constitution. Although he adapted and supplemented rather than originated, he completed the ground plan of the English government as it exists to-day. Those who came after had only to complete the edifice on the foundations which he had reared. By the end of his reign the principle was accepted that the King was in general bound to respect the privileges of his subjects and to observe the laws of the land; that the voice of the people should be declared in Parliament, a body, which for the first time completely represented all three classes of the realm, and that all taxes, except those sanctioned by custom, should be granted by this body.[1] Moreover, the common man was protected more securely than ever before by the law of the land against the feudal lord; the three common law courts, the King's Bench, the Common Pleas, and the Exchequer, had taken shape each with its distinct records; the circuits and functions of the itinerant justices had been carefully marked out, and the Council, to assist the King in his deliberations, had become a recognized institution; and a body of officials under the Chancellor was emerging which was to judge suits on their merits by right or "equity" when the common law was too inelastic to meet the requirements of an individual case. All this and more was brought about largely by a series of laws or statutes so comprehensive, and so superior in numbers and importance that the reign can almost be said to mark the beginnings of English legislation.

[1] These principles were often violated in subsequent centuries to come; but it was much to have secured their recognition thus early.

The First and Second Statutes of Westminster (1275, 1285). — Edward was determined to correct the abuses of officials acting in his name, as well as to enforce the royal rights: to that end, ordinances were issued to prevent extortion. The royal attitude is manifest too, in the first and second Statutes of Westminster, enacted in 1275 and 1285 respectively, which aimed "to redress the state of the Realm in such things as required amendment . . . that Common Right be done to all, as well Poor as Rich, without respect to Persons." These two Statutes are mainly a summary restatement of previous enactments such as Magna Carta and the Provisions of Westminster, and of the best features of the administrative measures of Henry II, and his successors. While their main aim is to deal with existing abuses in royal and feudal jurisdiction and to regulate the procedure of the courts rather than to formulate new general principles, the second Statute contains one important new provision — "concerning conditional gifts," *de donis conditionalibus*. It established entailed estates; that is, estates that should be handed down in an order of succession established by the original donor, failing which they should go back to him and his heirs. The measure was acceptable both to the King and to the great nobles, to the former because it enabled him, when the conditions were not fulfilled, to get back lands originally granted by the Crown, to the latter because it prevented their estates from being diminished by division among heirs or in payment of debt.

The Statute of "Mortmain" or de Religiosis (1279). — In 1279 Edward attempted to deal with another grievance. The Church had gradually absorbed fully a third of the lands of the kingdom, and these Church lands were said to be held in "Mortmain," as if by a dead hand that never relaxes its grasp, for corporations, unlike families, never died. Moreover, ecclesiastical holdings were exempt from most of the military obligations and other services, such as wardships, marriages, and reliefs. In consequence, the custom arose for those who wished to evade those obligations to grant their lands to the Church on condition of enjoying part of the income. In order to check this abuse Edward enacted his famous statute *De Religiosis*, or Mortmain, prohibiting such grants without royal license.[1]

The Statute of Winchester (1285). — By the Statute of Winchester the King sought to revive and reorganize the old institutions of national police and defense. Every district was to be responsible for the robberies, murders, burnings, thefts, and other crimes committed within its borders. In walled towns the gates were to be shut from

[1] The effect was regulative rather than prohibitive, for many licenses for alienation were given.

sunset to sunrise, and during the summer months the inhabitants were to set a watch at each gate, strangers were to be arrested and examined, and those who escaped were to be followed by the watch, with hue and cry, "from town to town until that they be taken and delivered to the sheriff." It was further enacted that every man, in proportion to his lands and goods, was to provide himself with arms and armor, according to the ancient Assize of Henry II. View of armor was to be made twice every year, and in every hundred and franchise two constables were to be chosen to perform this task, and, likewise, to report to the justices all failures, in their district, to keep arms and armor, to punish crime, to follow the hue and cry, as well as all illegal harboring of strangers, while the justices were in their turn to report such information to the King at every Parliament.

Expulsion of the Jews (1290). — One step backward taken by Edward was his expulsion of the Jews, in 1290. Welcomed by the Conqueror and his sons as agents for extorting money from their subjects, they were carefully protected by Henry II. Although legally chattels of the Crown, practically they became masters of the resources of the kingdom. Especially, since usury, or the taking of interest, was forbidden by the law of the Church, the bulk of the business of money lending fell into Jewish hands. Cruel massacres at the opening of Richard's reign indicate the popular hatred against them, due to their exemption from the laws of the land, and to their extortion for which they were not altogether to blame. Also they were accused of openly mocking at the belief and ceremonies of the Church, and wild stories were circulated of their buying Christian boys to crucify them. The old accusations were repeated in the reign of Edward with many more besides; for example, they were charged with playing into the hands of the rich by making over small mortgages to great landowners and even of forgery and money clipping. Edward was prejudiced against them, and his mother and the clergy were even more so; consequently, he readily agreed to drive them out in return for a parliamentary grant. By his bigotry he deprived himself of useful servants, and, no doubt, seriously retarded the financial development of the country. It was centuries before the Jews were allowed to return to England.

The Statute of Westminster III. ***Quia Emptores,* 1290.** — The same year, 1290, is notable for the passing of the third Statute of Westminster, otherwise known as *Quia Emptores*, from the opening words: "For as much as purchasers of land." It aimed to prevent the process of increasing sub-infeudation, whereby services due to great land-

owners were becoming so divided and confused that it was difficult to keep track of them. Henceforth, lands granted by a tenant ceased to be under his control and passed to that of his lord. In other words, the grantee was not the vassal of the grantor; but of the grantor's lord. As the Statute expressly authorized the sale or alienation of lands under such conditions, many landowners from financial necessity took advantage of the authorization, in spite of the restriction, and since the King was in many cases the overlord, the number of small freeholders was greatly increased.

Edward as a Ruler. Significance of his Reign. — Edward I was a masterful man who sought to be every inch a King, but he had the good of his subjects at heart and spent his life in their service. While claiming all that was due him, he was wise enough to recognize the limitations put upon the royal authority in the struggles of the century by admitting the two great principles that Parliament should represent all classes and that it should have a voice in granting all revenues over and above those belonging to the King by law and ancient usage. When, in addition, his legislative activity, his judicial and administrative reforms and all his other work is taken into account, it is evident that his reign is one of the most notable in the annals of the country.

Edward II (1307–1327). The Ordinances of 1311. — Edward of Carnarvon, the unworthy son of a worthy father, had been carefully trained in the business of war and state; he had acted as Regent in 1297, and accompanied his father on his later Scotch campaigns; nevertheless, he had no inclination or aptitude for business, and was so yielding in temper that he was the victim of unscrupulous favorites, unhappily choosing the worst when he needed the best. In the incessant conflicts which plagued the country from his very accession, the political issues, if they can be called such, were on a distinctly lower level than those of the last. The King was opposed, not as a strong man seeking to solve national problems in his own way, but because he was extravagant, frivolous, and incapable, while on the other hand, the men who led the fight against him were, even more than those of the preceding generation, seeking personal and class privileges.

Edward's heavy exactions and misgovernment received their first check and the first acute crisis came to a head, when in March, 1310, the barons, in the teeth of the royal prohibition, assembled fully armed, and forced the King to assent to the appointment of a body of twenty-one commissioners to reform the administration. These Lords Ordainers, as they were called, drew up a body of "Ordinances" which aimed not only to reform the whole system of finance and ad-

ministration of justice, but to transfer the governing power from the Crown to a narrow baronial oligarchy. In a frantic effort to save his favorite, Piers Gaveston — a greedy adventurer and trifler whose mocking tongue had contributed to estrange many of the royal opponents — Edward put off ratifying the Ordinances till October, 1311, and then broke his pledge. Thereupon the barons took up arms, captured Gaveston and, after a trial which was but a farce, beheaded him, 19 May, 1312.

The Scotch Victory at Bannockburn (1314). — Although this brought him to time, Edward failed to profit by the lesson. In consequence of his inability to attach his opponents to his service, the Scots were able to inflict on the English the most disastrous defeat in the centuries of conflict between the two countries. In the early summer of 1314 Edward marched to relieve Stirling Castle which the Scots were besieging. Though the hostile barons refused to follow in person and only grudgingly sent their legal contingents, the English army was the greatest ever yet sent to invade the north and outnumbered the enemy more than two to one. The battle, fought 24 June, in the royal park between Bannockburn and Stirling Castle ended in a complete rout for the English. Edward fled to Dunbar, whence he took to the sea and never stopped until he reached his own kingdom. During the remainder of the reign the northern border suffered one inroad after another. In 1323 Edward, though he still refused to acknowledge Bruce as King of the Scots, concluded a truce which was still in force at the close of the reign.

Temporary Triumph and the Declaration of 1322. — Edward subsequently found new favorites in the two Despensers, father and son, who although "neither foreigners nor upstarts," were regarded with envy by the barons because of their greed and ambition. Eventually they broke into armed revolt in 1322; but this time Edward was able to raise a force strong enough to gain a victory. As a result, the Ordinances were revoked in a Parliament held the same year and the important principle enunciated that: "matters which are to be established for the estate of our Lord the King and his heirs, and for the estate of the realm and the people, shall be treated, accorded, and established in Parliament by the King and by the Council of the prelates, earls, and barons, and the commonality of the realm." However, nothing came of this bid for popular support; the flighty Edward proved incapable of winning the people any more than the barons. For four years, from 1322 to 1326, he ruled completely subject to the Despensers. Disorder, failure, treachery were the results. To cap all, the Despensers affronted Queen Isabella, a passionate, unscrupu-

lous woman embittered by humiliation and neglect, who eagerly seized an opportunity which presented itself to overthrow the hated counselors, and, as it turned out, her Consort as well.

Overthrow and Deposition of the King (1326–1327). — In 1325 Isabella found a pretext for going to France, where, aided by Roger Mortimer, one of the disaffected lords, she gathered a party about her. In September she invaded England, and before the close of the year both the Despensers, against whom she had proclaimed war, fell into her hands and were put to death. For the King, who was also taken prisoner, a longer period of debasement and suffering was reserved. Parliament assembled, January, 1327. In a tumultuous meeting Prince Edward, a boy of fourteen, was chosen King. Then six articles were framed to justify the deposition of his father. They declared in substance: "that he was incompetent to govern, that he had neglected the business of the kingdom for unbecoming occupations, that he had lost Scotland . . . that he had imprisoned, exiled, and put to death many of the noble men of the land, that he had broken his coronation oath, especially in the matter of doing justice to all, that he had ruined the realm, and there was no hope of his correction." After he had, with much weeping, accepted the decree, homage and fealty were solemnly renounced. Even yet, the furious Queen pursued him with unrelenting ferocity until finally he was murdered, at Berkeley Castle, 21 September, 1327. The folly of Edward of Carnarvon brought upon him a terrible retribution, though the instruments of his downfall were most unworthy. Yet one step in their procedure was fraught with significance. They took a long stride in the direction of popular liberty when they called upon Parliament, as the voice of the people, to declare the great principle that allegiance to a King, who had ceased to govern in the interest of his subjects, might be renounced.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

Narrative. Tout; Ramsay, *The Dawn of the Constitution* and *The Genesis of Lancaster* (1913); K. H. Vickers, *England in the Later Middle Ages* (1913); and E. Jenks, *Edward Plantagenet* (1902), particularly good for the legislation of Edward I.

Constitutional. White, Taylor; Taswell-Langmead; and Stubbs, *Constitutional History;* Maitland, *Constitutional History of England* (1908) gives (pp. 18–164) an excellent account of the public law in the time of Edward I; Medley's *Manual* contains a good summary of the origin and development of Parliament. C. S. McIlwain, *The High Court of Parliament and its Supremacy* (1910) is an able discussion of the boundaries between legislative and judicial powers. L. O. Pike, *The Constitutional History of*

the House of Lords (1894) the standard work on the subject. For a full account of the origin and development of the law courts, see W. S. Holdsworth, *History of English Law* (1903), I.

Selections from the sources, Adams and Stephens, nos. 37–55.

Scotland. P. H. Brown, *History of Scotland* (3 vols., 1899–1909) is the best brief history.

CHAPTER XII

THE REIGN OF EDWARD III (1327–1377). THE BEGINNING OF THE HUNDRED YEARS' WAR. CHIVALRY AT ITS HEIGHT. THE GROWING IMPORTANCE OF THE COMMONS. THE INCREASE OF NATIONAL SENTIMENT. FIRST ATTACKS ON THE POWER OF ROME

The Misgovernment of Isabella and Mortimer (1327–1330). — Although Parliament appointed a guardian for young Edward and a Council to carry on the government during his minority, the real power was in the hands of the Queen Mother and Mortimer, who shamelessly appropriated two thirds of the royal revenue and were so high-handed that "no one dared to open his mouth for the good of the King or of the kingdom." This continued till 1330, when Edward, now eighteen, determined to put an end to their intolerable rule. With a trusty follower and a body of men-at-arms he seized the guilty pair, and issued a proclamation that henceforth he would govern himself. Heavy charges were framed in Parliament against Mortimer, who was condemned without a hearing, and hanged 29 November, while Isabella was allowed to live in honorable retirement till her death, assuming a nun's habit in her later years.

Character of the New King. — Edward, now truly King, shone during most of a long and eventful reign as the typical hero of chivalry. Generous to a fault, with a bearing at once courtly and winning, he excelled in "beautiful feats of arms," both in the tournament and in war. On the other hand, he was ambitious, prodigal, and ostentatious, having no interest in his people except in so far as they contributed resources for his pleasures and his warlike designs. Hence, while he dazzled them for a time by the glories he achieved, he failed in the long run to win their hearts, and reverses in his later years left him a broken, deserted man. Spending most of his life fighting, now with France, now with Scotland, he brought England into a prominence that she had never before enjoyed, but the price was a heavy one, and the ultimate result was failure. Other aspects of his reign, less dra-

matic, were enduring. Parliament shaped itself into the modern House of Lords and House of Commons, while the Lower House began to assert rights which point the way to its later position as mouthpiece of the nation. Commerce advanced with tremendous strides, feudalism and chivalry yielded to the rising importance of the middle class, and a new literature in the national tongue made its appearance. Significant religious changes manifested themselves, forerunners of a movement which was, in less than two centuries, to overthrow the universal supremacy of the Church of Rome. Finally, labor and capital began a conflict which has continued with varying intensity even to this day.

The Hundred Years' War and its Significance. — In April, 1328, Robert Bruce died, leaving a little son David as his heir. Thereupon, Edward Balliol set himself up as king, and, with the support of an expedition sent by Edward III, overcame the party of Bruce at Halidon Hill. The little David was sent to France, and the determination of Philip IV to assist him plunged England into a war which lasted well into the next century.

"The Hundred Years' War," as it is called, profoundly affected many aspects of English history. Socially, it brought the middle and lower classes to the front, for it demonstrated in battle the superiority of the yeoman archer over the mailed knight, and it produced poverty and discontent which contributed much to labor risings of peasants against their lords. Politically, it resulted in notable concessions wrung from the King as a result of his need of money for carrying on campaigns. Moreover, owing to a considerable degree to the fact that the Papacy fell temporarily under the control of France, a conflict with Rome was developed which culminated in the Reformation. Finally, the war created a spirit of nationality in the two countries; England as purely English and France as purely French are a product of this struggle.

Causes of the Hundred Years' War. — In the first year of the war, 7 October, 1337, Edward assumed the title of King of France. Although this was a mere pretext, although other and more complex causes made the conflict inevitable, it is necessary to understand the grounds on which he based his claims. On the death of Charles IV, in 1328, it was maintained, in behalf of Edward, that his mother, sister of the late King, was the next lineal heir. The peers of France, however, decided in favor of Philip, an uncle of Charles IV, on the ground that, by the law of the Salian Franks — one of the ancestral tribes of the modern Frenchmen — women could neither inherit estates nor transmit them to a son. After some negotiations, Edward accepted

the situation and did homage to the new monarch, Philip VI, for his possessions in France. Philip, however, burning to extend his sway over Guyenne, irritated him by constant encroachments. Then came Philip's espousal of the cause of the Scots. While these were the two main causes which led to Edward's resumption of his pretensions to the French succession and his subsequent invasion, other reasons contributed to urge him on. Chief among them was the English King's desire to get a foothold in the County of Flanders where the Flemings, the great cloth makers of the period, had recently revolted against their overlord, Count Louis, who suppressed them with French aid, and sought to prevent Edward from entering into negotiations with his disaffected cities by prohibiting all commercial intercourse with the English, and by seizing their merchants and confiscating their goods.

The Opening of the War (1337), and Edward's First Campaigns (1338–1340). — Before embarking on a campaign Edward sought alliances abroad, of which the most imposing was with the Emperor Louis, the Bavarian. Philip VI, who formed counter-alliances, began war, 24 May, 1337, by pronouncing the seizure of Guyenne where several castles were besieged and capitulated. The people of Ghent, embittered by the interference with their trade, put at their head Jacques Van Arteveld, a rich cloth merchant. The leading Flemish cities joined with Ghent, and, in June, 1338, concluded a treaty of commerce. In July Edward sailed for Flanders; but while the Emperor Louis, as temporal head of Christendom, solemnly guaranteed his title to the crown of France, his allies were slow in coming to his aid, his finances were inadequate, and it was months before he was ready to face his enemy. Finally, in October, 1339, he invaded France. Philip, who had a glorious array, sent a herald with a formal challenge to a pitched battle; yet when the English King eagerly accepted his challenge, he suddenly turned about and started for Paris. Edward returned to Flanders, and, in February 1340, crossed over to England leaving hostages to the Flemings for his enormous debts. The campaign had been little more than a grand parade, though the poor folk along his line of march suffered bitterly, for flaming towns and villages marked the wake of his progress through a fertile and populous district. To the knightly class war was a noble pastime; to the peasantry it was a gruesome reality. Equipped with new supplies, Edward started on a second expedition 22 June, 1340. Brushing aside the French fleet lurking to intercept him along the Flemish coast, he made himself master of the narrow seas; but the land campaign was fully as futile and inglorious as that of the previous year. Philip cautiously refused to fight; Edward's allies proved as apathetic as ever, and his debts accumulated

steadily. So he patched up a truce, and, in November, stole "away privately for England to elude his creditors." One by one his allies dropped off, the last to go being the Flemish cities, after the murder of their leader, Van Arteveld, in a popular rising in 1345.

The Campaign of 1346 and the Battle of Crécy (26 August). — Largely owing to lack of funds, Edward was unable to resume active hostilities till 1346, when the first notable triumph in the Hundred Years' War was achieved. Landing on the Norman coast, 12 July, he had intended to march south and join another English force which had been operating in Gascony since the previous year, but finding that the main French army under Philip's son John blocked his way, he turned north and made for the Flemish coast. Philip, who had hastily gathered additional forces, sent detachments ahead and made vain efforts to intercept him first at the Seine and then at the Somme. Edward, having successfully forded the latter river — for the bridges were all destroyed or securely guarded — halted at Crécy and disposed his forces on the slope of a hillside, his men-at-arms dismounted and protected on both flanks by archers, to give battle to Philip and the bulk of his army hurrying in pursuit. There Philip attacked, 26 August, with a force estimated at 60,000, or three times the number of the English. However, his crossbowmen, his men-at-arms and, finally, his mailed knights in successive charges were stopped, riddled, and routed by the deadly flight of the arrows of the English longbowmen. Night ended the carnage, when Philip, after leading a final vain charge, was persuaded to withdraw. Edward's son, the Black Prince, a youth of sixteen, won his spurs in the brunt of the battle. At Crécy, Edward completed successfully a foolhardy campaign by a victory due to splendid tactics, to the choice of a strong position, and a skillful combination of archers and men-at-arms. The ultimate consequences were momentous; for the very foundations of medieval society were shaken when the flower of French mailed knighthood had to yield to yeomen archers, and to Welsh and Irish serfs armed with knives and spears. It was a mortal blow at the old system of warfare and the social and political structure built on it.

The Siege and Capture of Calais (1346–1347). — On 28 August, Edward started for Calais, which he was anxious to secure. Not only was it a refuge for pirates and privateers who devastated English shipping, but it commanded the Channel, and offered an easy means of communication with Flanders as well as a basis of operations against France. Finding the place too strong to carry by assault, he prepared for a siege. Throughout the long winter, and until well into the following summer, the inhabitants held out. Efforts to relieve them by sea

failed, and finally Philip appeared with an army; but he suddenly departed, declaring it was better to lose the town than to put the lives of his men in jeopardy. Thus deserted and with the garrison starving the Governor consented to treat. According to a familiar story, Edward required six leading burgesses to come forth with halters around their necks and the keys of the town in their hands, and was only persuaded from putting them to death by the tears of his Queen. At any rate, he did spare the lives of the whole garrison, though he replaced the old population by English settlers. For two hundred years Calais was held as an English market and fortress.

English Magnificence and Ostentation. — The capture of Calais was the turning point in the career of Edward III. Although only thirty-five years old he withdrew almost entirely from the war, and occupied himself with domestic concerns, with hunting and hawking tournaments. For eight years hostilities were nominally suspended; but, while the truce was frequently renewed, it was frequently broken in Guyenne where the "unhappy citizens had hardly more quiet in peace than in war." In England, on the other hand, it seemed as if a "new sun had risen on account of the abundance of peace, the plenty, and the glory of the victories." What with constant plays and tournaments the upper classes seemed to live only for pleasure.[1] Dress was gorgeous and extravagant; that of the women is described "as diverse and wonderful," even the clergy adorned themselves magnificently, more like soldiers and men of fashion than servants of God.

Causes for Popular Discontent. — However, the picture had its reverse side. While the war brought much booty it involved great expense, and the exactions levied to meet it aroused stout opposition. Edward was ever copious with promises which he did not observe. When he sought the advice of the Commons it was only to put them under the obligation of paying for the policy in which they acquiesced. In order to evade responsibility, they professed themselves, in 1348, too ignorant and simple to advise him in military affairs; at the same time they presented no less than sixty petitions complaining of abuses, such as monopolies of wool and tin, and an unauthorized impost on manufactured cloth. In view of the King's usual assurances, they granted supplies; but the growing discontent was to come to a head before the close of the reign.

The Black Death (1348–1349). — Moreover, the country was visited by a frightful scourge from which it was never again wholly free for

[1] It was probably in this period that Edward founded the celebrated Order of the Garter, in imitation or memory of King Arthur's Round Table, an order which still remains the most exalted in England.

more than three centuries. The Black Death, as it was called, appeared first in Asia, whence it spread along the trade routes to Europe, reaching England in the late summer of 1348. While its appearance was foretold by all manner of signs and wonders: "an extraordinary dreadful comet"; showers of blood, and the appearance of strange monsters, as a matter of fact famine — due to floods, droughts, and the devastations of war — and the unhealthful conditions of ventilation and drainage prepared the way for ravages of the plague. It was a most loathsome and contagious disease. Among its symptoms were boils, vomiting of blood, fever, and black patches all over the body — whence its name; it created the greatest havoc in the overcrowded parts of cities, but there was little chance of escape for such as had once breathed the tainted air. Those who fled to the fields and woods fell dead and spread the contagion on the way, and ships were found at sea with not a living soul on board. The administration of justice ceased for lack of judges; and, in many places, divine service stopped because the priests had died or fled. Numbers of villages were wholly deserted, and the grass grew long in the flourishing port of Bristol. The Scots, who mocked at the "foul death" of the English, caught the infection and lost a third of their population.

Moral and Religious Effects of the Black Death. — The approaching end of the world was predicted. Some gave themselves over to excesses of drinking and reveling; but the greater number, regarding the plague as a divine visitation for their sins, sought to avert the wrath of God by exaggerated religious observances. For example, a queer sect known as the "Brotherhood of the Flagellants" (the "whippers") was revived; passing over to England from Hungary and Germany they went about from town to town scourging one another with iron-tipped scourges and chanting mournful hymns. Multitudes on the Continent and not a few in England joined their ranks. The Pope, who regarded such fanatical excitement as dangerous to established order, issued a bull, in 1349, for their suppression, though it was only with the return of quieter times that they gradually disappeared.

Social and Economic Effects. — In England the Black Death precipitated a social and industrial crisis. Losing, it is estimated, from a third to a half of its population, the number of laborers in the country was so diminished that they began to demand excessive wages and the value of land fell steadily from lack of cultivation. "Sheep and cattle strayed through the fields and corn, and there was none who could drive them"; harvests rotted on the ground; then, to make matters worse, a murrain among the cattle accompanied the plague. While some landlords remitted rents of their tenants and actually re-

duced the service due from villeins to hold them on the land, others sought vainly to get their lands cultivated by resorting to all sorts of antiquated claims of service, or at least by claiming strictly such as were actually due. On 18 June, 1349, the King issued an Ordinance ordering that all unemployed persons should be compelled to work at wages prevalent before the recent calamity. Penalties were fixed for those who refused, and also for those who offered higher wages, or gave anything by way of charity to idle beggars. As an offset, it was provided that fish, flesh, and fowl should be sold at a reasonable price. The Ordinance proved ineffective, and, in 1351, Parliament reënacted its measures in the Statute of Laborers, one of the long series to follow. The laborers, however, were so "puffed up and quarrelsome" that they would not obey, and the landlords had to leave their crops ungathered or violate the law by paying increased rates. It must be said that the laws of supply and demand and the decreased purchasing power of money to some extent justify the laborers. The result of the new conditions was to change the whole system of farming; great landlords ceased to farm their estates with the aid of stewards, and leased them to tenant cultivators or else turned them into sheep pastures. Still it should be emphasized that the Black Death only accentuated changes already in progress, for the growth of manufactures, the spread of commerce, and the attraction of military service drew many from the land, and the landlords would have suffered had there been no plague. Laws to turn back the hands of the clock were unavailing.

A Decade of Important Legislation. — Parliament, during the decade following the Black Death, was uncommonly active. In 1351 it passed the celebrated Statute of Provisors, which declared invalid all appointments or provisions made by the Pope to English benefices, and punished with imprisonment all who accepted such appointments. Two years later, 1353, the Statute of Praemunire[1] enacted, that any one carrying suits to foreign courts should be liable to forfeiture of lands and chattels, imprisonment of person, and outlawry, though the Pope and clergy, against whom these provisions are clearly aimed, are not mentioned in the Act.[2] More than once reënacted, neither of the two above Statutes were obeyed during the fourteenth century. The Act of Treasons, 1352, is important as the first legislative attempt to define the crime. Seven offenses were enumerated — including the compassing the death of the King or his consort or

[1] A corruption of the Latin *praemonere* — to be forewarned.

[2] In the reënactments of these respective Statutes in 1391 and 1393, however, they are distinctly mentioned.

his heir; adhering to his enemies; slaying his Ministers or his judges; and counterfeiting the Great Seal or the royal coins. In 1363 the Chancellor opened Parliament with a speech in English. In the previous year it had been enacted that English should be the language of the law courts, for the reason that the "people have no knowledge nor understanding of that which is said for or against them," and that the court records should be in Latin.[1] By an act of 1362, renewed in 1371, it was provided that no subsidy on wool should be laid without the consent of Parliament. In 1363 a sumptuary law regulated very minutely matters of diet and dress to prevent the impoverishment of the country exhausted by plague and war. If part of the people were intent on fighting and display, there was a class who were grappling with the realities of life.

The Battle of Poitiers (16 September, 1356). — In 1355 war was renewed in real earnest. When, July, 1356, the Black Prince, who had been in Aquitaine since the previous year, started from Bordeaux for a raid through central France, King John, who had suceeded his father Philip VI, in 1350, marched south to defend his threatened territories. Eventually the two armies met near the town of Poitiers, and, in the battle which followed, as at Crécy, the French outnumbered the English three to one. Again the mailed knight was overcome by the English longbow, while King John, struggling manfully, was taken prisoner, together with his young son Philip. The Black Prince, however, was able to make little immediate use of his victory in a military way. Too weak to attempt to capture the city whither most of the vanquished fled for refuge, he hurried on to Bordeaux with his booty and his more important prisoners. On 23 March, 1357, a truce was arranged for two years, and, in May, John was taken a captive to London. While his people were ground with taxes and pillaged by roving soldiery, both English and French, he spent his captivity pleasantly in the chase and tournament.

The Peace of Bretigny (1360). — Another invasion led by King Edward and his four sons failed to achieve any notable success, since the French shut themselves up in their strong towns and castles and it was practically impossible to support the English army in the wasted country. Accordingly, terms of peace were finally arranged in 1360. By the Treaty of Bretigny it was tacitly understood that Edward should renounce his claims to the French throne. In return he re-

[1] As a matter of fact, however, cases continued to be argued and reported in French till well into the seventeenth century; the language of the Statutes was French till Henry VII, and Latin did not cease to be the language of writs, charters, and records until 1731.

ceived all of the ancient Aquitaine,[1] with many smaller districts in the south, and certain territories including Calais in the north. Also the French renounced their alliance with the Scots and the English renounced theirs with the Flemings. "Good brother France," said Edward, "you and I are now, thank God, of good accord." Such rejoicings proved premature, for in spite of the sincere efforts of King John, the French nobles in the ceded districts stoutly resisted the transfer of their allegiance, and towns were even more stubborn. Some districts refused to submit at all. Moreover, the French were unable to pay the installments of John's ransom, whereupon he returned to England, where he died in 1364.

The Tide Begins to Turn against England. — Two years before, King Edward had erected Gascony and Guyenne into a separate principality and conferred it upon the Black Prince. In view of the Prince's past successes and the disordered condition of France, the prospects of the English seemed as bright as those of the French seemed dark; but the tide was on the turn. John's successor, Charles V, greatly aided by Bertrand du Guesclin, who came to be recognized as the greatest general of the age, was able to win back ground that his more martial father had lost. Moreover, the Black Prince played into his hands by taking up the cause of Pedro the Cruel, a faithless and bloodthirsty creature, who had been driven from the throne of Castile. The Prince afterwards complained that the devil had dragged him into mixing in the affair — and well he might; for it involved fighting in Spain where he contracted a disease that caused his premature death, and it compelled him to levy taxes from his Gascon subjects which aroused them to revolt.

Renewal of the War (1369). — Charles V had taken advantage of the situation to make ready for war and to cultivate the disaffected among the Gascon nobles. When they appealed to him against the burden of taxation, he seized the opportunity, although he had no right to interfere in the affairs of Aquitaine, and actually, 15 January, 1369, summoned the Prince to Paris to answer the complaints of his own subjects. A defiant refusal, which he received, together with the continued pillaging of his territories by English companies, prompted him to send the King of England a formal declaration of war, 29 April, and Edward replied by resuming the arms and title of the King of France. The war which followed "never rose above a series of raids, skirmishes, and sieges," in which the English, notwithstanding a few successes, met with one reverse after another and continually lost ground. Many causes contributed to this result. Edward III,

[1] It included Guyenne and Gascony.

grown prematurely old, had withdrawn from active fighting, the Black Prince was suffering grievously from dropsy, and, at the same time, the English army had deteriorated owing to the fact that the depleted ranks of the archers, who had won the earlier battles, were filled by a motley throng of foreign auxiliaries. Moreover, the French tactics steadily exhausted their adversaries. On the English approach they wasted the land round about and took refuge in a castle or walled town, while Bertrand du Guesclin, constantly appearing and attacking remote and ill-defended garrisons, never stayed to face a relieving force and wore out the defenders of the land in futile marches and pursuits. In January, 1371, the Black Prince, completely shattered in health, was succeeded by his brother John of Gaunt,[1] who, however, was unable to improve the situation. At length a truce was concluded which, by renewal, lasted till the end of the reign, when all that remained of the former vast conquests of the English were Bordeaux, Bayonne, Calais, and Brest.

The Good Parliament (1376). — Owing to the burden of taxation, the ill success of the war, and general maladministration, public discontent grew steadily. The Black Prince recovered his health sufficiently to head the opposition, which was directed against the Court party, particularly against John of Gaunt and Alice Perrers, an unworthy favorite, to whom the King was devoted. The crisis came to a head in the "Good Parliament," called, in 1376, to obtain money for continuing the war. For the first time the House of Commons strikingly asserted their growing power — they demanded an audit of accounts, and proceeded to lay bare the iniquities of the King's counselors, to whom they attributed the national poverty. The leading offenders were mentioned by name and brought to account. Lord Latimer, the King's chamberlain, was accused of buying up debts, of extorting huge sums, of selling strong places to the enemy, and of intercepting fines which should have been paid into the royal treasury. Richard Lyons, a London merchant and former farmer of the customs, had been associated with him in various frauds — lending the King money at a usurious rate, forestalling the markets at ports, and raising the price of foreign imports. In bringing them to account a new process was employed, impeachment, which consists of a trial by the House of Lords on the basis of an accusation brought by the Commons against a public official for a public offense. Both were convicted and were sentenced to imprisonment and forfeiture, though Latimer, released on bail, managed to elude the execution of his sentence.

[1] So called from Ghent, his birthplace.

The Reforms of the Good Parliament Frustrated by John of Gaunt. — Although the reform party attempted some important work during the remaining weeks of the session, the work of the Good Parliament practically terminated with the death of the Black Prince, 6 June, 1376. His chivalry was of the prevailing artificial type, without real gentleness or humanity; he had little military genius, but he was a brave dashing leader, and his patience in suffering and his manful fight against corruption and misgovernment, even if impelled by hostility against his brother, made him deservedly popular. John of Gaunt gained the ascendancy, and caused the late Parliament to be declared no Parliament. A new one, which met 27 January, 1377, wholly under his influence, was the first of the "packed parliaments," so called because composed largely of members pledged to do the will of the Government, the necessity of such an expedient being a striking evidence of the growing power of the Commons. Alice Perrers, who had been driven from Court, was allowed to return and the acts against her and Lord Latimer were reversed.

John Wiclif (?–1384). — John of Gaunt, head of a corrupt Court clique, was opposed to clerical ascendancy, and, in his struggle against it, took to himself a curious ally — John Wiclif, the first English reformer. Born sometime about 1324, in Yorkshire, Wiclif had passed most of his life at Oxford as a student and teacher of theology, though, in course of time, he came to supplement his academic work with that of a parish priest. John of Gaunt, finding that Wiclif, whom he first came to know in 1374, had been for some time occupied in framing views on the relations between the spiritual and the temporal power of the Church, undertook to make use of him in his battle against ecclesiastical influence in political affairs. Wiclif's first appearance in public affairs was shortly before the meeting of the Good Parliament, when he published a treatise against the papal claim to collect arrears of the annual tribute promised by King John. However, no payment had been made since the accession of Edward III, and he was but voicing protests made in Parliament as early as 1366 against its renewal. Convocation, which met with Parliament in the winter, determined to call the reformer to account, primarily to strike a blow at his champion. On 19 February, 1377, he appeared before the assembled Bishops at St. Paul's accompanied by Duke John and the Earl Marshal; but the trial broke up owing to a fierce quarrel between his notable supporters and the Bishop of London; the London mob, who hated John and the Marshal because of encroachments on the privileges of the City, taking the side of their Bishop. The next day the uproar became so great that John of Gaunt had to flee. The enemies of Wiclif

then applied to the Pope, who, in May, issued a series of bulls against him, but they did not arrive till the beginning of the new reign.

Death of Edward III (1377). — Since Christmas, 1376, the old King had remained in retirement. When it was certain that the end was near, Alice Perrers stripped the rings from his fingers and fled, the courtiers about him followed suit, and Edward III, once the glory of his generation, passed away 21 June, deserted except for a single priest, who remained out of compassion to minister the last offices of the Church. The pomp and circumstance, the chivalrous ideal, the strong personal power of the Monarch had faded away before Edward's body passed to the grave. New forces, economic discontent, political opposition, religious revolt, and the birth of a new literature were already struggling into being; but how they grew and what they meant was not left for him to see.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

Narrative. In addition to Tout, Ramsay, Vickers and Stubbs, William Longman, *The Life and Times of Edward III* (2 vols., 1869); James Mackinnon, *The History of Edward III* (1900); and C. H. Pearson, *English History in the Fourteenth Century* (1876). A good brief account of the period is William Warburton, *Edward III* (1887). S. Armitage Smith, *John of Gaunt* (1904) and R. P. Dunn-Pattison, *The Black Prince* (1910) are both scholarly biographies. G. M. Trevelyan, *England in the Age of Wycliffe* (1899) gives an interesting survey of political, social, and religious history in the last years of Edward III and the early years of Richard II. There are various translations of Froissart's famous chronicle; the best is that of Lord Berners (Tudor translations, 1901) and there is a useful abridgment by G. C. Macaulay and another in *Everyman's Library* (1906).

Selections from the sources, Adams and Stephens, nos. 56–83.

CHAPTER XIII

LIFE IN ENGLAND UNDER THE FIRST THREE EDWARDS (1272–1377)

Parliamentary Gains in the Fourteenth Century. — Before the end of the thirteenth century the two principles had been recognized that the three estates of the realm should be represented in Parliament, and that all taxes, except those sanctioned by custom, should be granted by the representative body. In the fourteenth century the estates were grouped into two houses, and steps were taken to prevent the King from evading the general limitations placed on his taxing power and to assert the rights of Parliament in legislation. The prevention of the royal practice of collecting tallages and subsidies on wool has already been noted. Other gains remain to be pointed out. In 1373 Parliament began to grant the King tonnage and poundage, *i. e.* customs on wine and merchandise, which for nearly three centuries furnished an important supplement to tenths and fifteenths,[1] the usual direct taxes, also granted by Parliament. By a tight hold on the purse-strings Parliament managed to secure many liberties and privileges, since, even in ordinary times, — to say nothing of war and other crises — the regular Crown revenues were insufficient without special grants. While the King, after his immediate need was supplied, repudiated many concessions that were wrung from him, they nevertheless furnished valuable precedents in future struggles. One great step in advance was the share which the Commons gained in making the laws. At first they were only asked to give their consent to bills framed by the King and Council, and not infrequently, royal ordinances were issued which had the force of law without Parliamentary sanction. However, since subjects, either individually or collectively, enjoyed the right of presenting petitions, such petitions began to be framed and presented by their representatives in Parliament. The

[1] So called because originally they consisted of a tenth of the revenues or chattels from burgesses and a fifteenth of those from the landholders of shires. After 1334 the amount of a tenth and fifteenth was a fixed sum — £39,000.

advantage was twofold: action was concerted, and Parliament could enforce its demands by its control over money grants. By the beginning of the fifteenth century it had become a fixed practice for the Commons to vote supplies only at the end of the session. Less than fifty years later, their claim, asserted in the previous century, was finally recognized, that answers to petitions should be enacted as law in the exact words in which they were first presented. Altogether, the fourteenth century was a time of great advance for Parliament. Its form of organization was determined; it had greatly curtailed the right of arbitrary taxation; it had come to be consulted in public business; it had claimed a voice in the appointment of Ministers and the right to call them to account; it had deposed one King; before the close of the century it deposed another and even established a new line of succession. Later events were to show that most of the gains were premature, but as precedents they, nevertheless, contributed powerfully to the ultimate progress of the English Constitution.

Trade and Industry. Passage from Local to Central Control. — The commercial and industrial advance of this period is equally noteworthy, in the growth of the wool trade, in English shipping, and in the remarkable development of the English cloth manufacture. Up to the time of Edward I, regulation and control of trade were largely local, and were hampered by vexatious restrictions. Privileged towns and local magnates levied tolls on all goods bought and sold at markets and fairs that entered city gates, that unloaded at wharves, or that passed along certain roads. Merchants of chartered boroughs, banded together in their gilds, enjoyed exclusive privileges of trading within their district, while alien merchants, in addition to other handicaps, were forbidden to engage in retail trade at all. Aside from certain royal enactments regulating the price of bread, ale, and cloth there was no central control whatever. The regulations of Edward I, made "with the counsel and consent of the Commons of England," mark an epoch; for the towns, which had hitherto treated separately with the Crown, were now united in Parliament to secure measures for their class as a whole. Edward "laid the foundations of a system of national regulation of commerce and industry," and by his work made it possible for his grandson to develop an international commerce. In 1275 he agreed with his Parliament to accept a fixed toll on wools, wool-fells, leather, and upon wine; he appointed officers called customers to collect revenue and to put down smuggling, and, to aid in this work, he named certain staple towns to which all trade in wool, the chief commodity of the kingdom, should be confined. In order to encourage and protect those engaged in traffic, he enacted better

and more general police regulations, and by the Statute of Merchants provided security for creditors. Finally, he took measures for a purer and more reliable currency, and had tables set up at Dover where all merchants and pilgrims should exchange the money and plate they brought in for the coin of the realm. Edward III supplemented these efforts by selecting twenty ports where such exchanges could be made. Both Edward I and his grandson favored the Gascon merchants who imported wine and the Flemings who exported wool. While the expulsion of the Jews by Edward I and the ruin of the Italians under the burden of Edward III's debts threw much business into the hands of the natives, and while great efforts were made to exclude foreigners from the English retail trade, the bulk of the foreign commerce was carried on by the latter till the reign of Richard II. There is much confusion and contradiction in the commerce legislation of the period, owing to the fact that as yet no general theories on the subject had been evolved and each measure enacted was largely experimental. The main aim, however, was to make exports dear and imports cheap rather than to build up English shipping and industry.

The Wool Trade and Shipping. — By the close of the thirteenth century England had come to be the great wool producing country of Europe, with her chief market among the Flemish weavers. Various attempts were made to fix the towns or staples where the wool should be sold; sometimes they were in England, sometimes in the Low Countries, while, for a short period in the reign, trade was free and the staple towns were done away with altogether. In 1362 the staple was removed to Calais, where it remained, except for short intervals, till the town passed back to the French, in 1558. The native shipper in the early part of the reign of Edward III had to contend against great obstacles. The foreigner and the King's agent were greatly favored at his expense and he was generally prohibited from exporting wool out of the country; even when the staple was fixed at Calais he could only as a rule take it across the Channel. Moreover, the North Sea was swarming with pirates and the coast towns were frequently subject to hostile raids. Indeed the bold seamen of the Cinque Ports when not engaged in the royal service often preyed on the commerce of their countrymen. But the sovereignty of the narrow seas asserted by Edward I was, for a time at least, made a reality by Edward III in consequence of his naval victories and the capture of Calais. For a while the seas were better policed than ever before. Piracy, however, did not altogether disappear. With the decline of Edward's vigor the navy fell into decay, and the English shipping and port towns began once more to suffer. The reign of Richard II was even more dis-

astrous from the naval and commercial point of view. An attempt to build up English shipping by Navigation Acts came to nothing. The ships of merchants were seized for the royal necessities, yet the navy was even more neglected than in the last years of Edward III. Discipline was lax, trade was unprotected, the country was in constant danger of invasion, and the most brilliant achievements on the sea were due to the patriotism and gallantry of individuals.

Regulation of Native Industry and the Advent of New Industries. — Careful provision was made to prevent fraud in particular callings; for instance, a royal proclamation of 1340 prohibited the London butchers from sewing the fat of good beef on joints of lean. In 1363 merchants were required to deal in one sort of merchandise only, and handicraftmen to keep to one "mystery" or craft, except women who were engaged in such callings as brewing, baking, spinning, and the like. Edward's frequent prohibition of the export of wool did much to encourage the native manufacture, which he fostered also by encouraging the Flemish weavers to come over to exercise their craft and to teach others. There had been migrations from Flanders ever since the Conquest, but the weavers now came in such numbers as to mark a new era in the development of English cloth manufacture.

Sumptuary Legislation. — Edward III enacted various sumptuary laws which were aimed partly to protect native industries against foreign importations, partly to check extravagance and promote thrift, and had reference particularly to the lesser folk who had begun to imitate the upper classes in elaborate dress and costly meats, even before the temporary enrichment of the country from the loot of the French wars. Such excesses "sore grieved" the great men of the realm, who saw "evil therein . . . as well to the souls as bodies" — a most serious one in their eyes, no doubt, was that it impoverished the subjects so that they were "not able to aid themselves nor their liege lord in time of need." Sumptuary laws were as old as the Romans, and were not unprecedented in England; but Edward's were frequent and far reaching. They regulated the amount and quality of food a man should eat, they forbade any but members of the royal family to wear cloth except of English manufacture, and regulated the apparel of every class in the community from the servant and the handicraftsman to the noble.

Gilds. — The artisan in the fourteenth century seems to have been in a very prosperous state. To a considerable degree this was due to the protection of the Crown and Parliament, faulty and inadequate as it was. Concurrently with this central regulation that of the local organizations survived to some extent. But the gild merchants were

gradually disappearing, either by merging with the municipal organization or with the various craft gilds. Division of labor was still highly developed. In this period London alone had some fifty separate mysteries. The bow maker could not make arrows; the cordwainer made shoes while the cobbler patched them. Each gild had its masters, its journeymen who worked by the day, and its apprentices who paid a sum of money in return for which they were taught the trade and supplied with food, drink, and clothing. Every craft had a court with elected officers to regulate trade disputes. In the craft as well as in the older merchant gilds the religious, benevolent, and social aspects were prominent: they had patron saints and processions on holy days; they provided money for masses for the souls of dead members; they maintained altar lights at the parish church and often supported a chaplain; they relieved the poverty of their poorer brethren and their families; and they contributed money for the marriage portion of the daughters of members or for sending them into nunneries; moreover, periodical feasts were an essential part of their organization. In a word "the gild in its various forms supplied to the people of the fourteenth century local clubs, local trade unions, and local friendly societies."

Ordinances against Usury. — A striking feature of medieval economics is the sentiment against "usury," as any lending of money at interest was called. An Ordinance of 1363 denounces it as a "false and abominable contract, under colour and cover of good and lawful trading," which "ruins the honour and soul of the agent, and sweeps away the goods and property of him who appears to be accommodated." To understand this attitude it must be borne in mind that business conditions were quite different from those of later times. There were no credit systems, or banks in the modern sense; indeed, money was seldom borrowed except for emergencies — to build a church or a monastery, to pay taxes suddenly imposed, to go on a pilgrimage or crusade, to fit out a military expedition. Rates were too high to make borrowing for commercial purposes profitable, and the usual practice for a man without capital who wanted to embark on a venture was to form a partnership with another to furnish the money and share the risk. The nearest approach to bankers were brokers who brought the borrowers and lenders together, and law and public opinion long frowned upon them. The medieval borrower could not see why, if he furnished security and paid his loan at the appointed time, he should render more than he had received to one who had incurred no risk. Had he caused his creditor inconvenience by failing to keep his agreement, then, and then only, was he prepared to pay interest.

Money lending, then, was regarded as a barren employment of funds which the lender ought more properly to invest in a partnership where he shared in the legitimate gains and risks.

Agriculture and Enclosures. — The tendency to commute the personal services of villein cultivators into money rents, already evident in the thirteenth century, became marked in the fourteenth. Lords and bailiffs preferred to hire laborers rather than to depend upon unwilling service. Moreover, the pomp and ceremony of chivalry, the increasing luxury, and the demands of building called for ready money. More and more, too, sheep raising began to be substituted for tillage. This was due to two causes: to the widening market for wool both at home and abroad; and to the scarcity of labor after the Black Death. The process is known as "enclosing" from the means taken to prevent the sheep from straying. Both arable land and the old common fields were appropriated by the lords for their purpose. As the population began to recover during the next two centuries, enclosing began to be regarded as a hardship because it required much land and few laborers.

Life of the People. Lawlessness. Justices of the Peace. — Conditions were still primitive when cows could be strangled by wolves in Lincolnshire. The state of the country was so lawless that merchants had to travel in large parties accompanied by armed horsemen for security. The woods were full of outlaws who robbed all who came their way, and even, on occasion, seized the King's judges and held them for ransom. Some were even bold enough to force their way into the law courts and overawe the justices. Moreover, the nobles often kept such ruffians in their pay and protected them, a custom which soon became widespread under the name of livery and maintenance.[1] One means of keeping order was the establishment of the justices of the peace; in 1344 any two or more were intrusted with limited judical functions, while, in 1362, all from the county were empowered to hold four sessions a year, known as "quarter sessions," to try certain cases less serious than those reserved for the King's judges. They were chosen from the best county families and from the borough magistrates and served without pay. Besides keeping the peace and trying smaller offenders all the duties of local administration came to be loaded upon them, such as carrying out the statutes of Laborers and the later Poor Laws. Punishments were barbarous, aiming at retribution and vengeance rather than prevention of crime. Prisoners were thrown, some-

[1] "Livery" comes from the provisions and clothes which were delivered as pay; it was later applied to the badge worn by such retainers and has survived in the modern servants' uniforms. "Maintenance" comes from the lord's custom of "maintaining" the suits of his servants in Court.

times naked, into horrible dungeons, dark, damp, indescribably filthy, often partly filled with water and swarming with rats and vermin, and their usual fare was moldy bread and stagnant water. Lesser offenders were put in the stocks. Torture was common to make the accused confess, or to make him submit to jury trial. The horrible practice of breaking on the wheel, where a man was stretched out and his limbs broken with an iron bar, was not unknown, hanging was most common, and, as towns and local lords had this right, gallows were often seen, gruesome spots on the landscape. In cases of treason a man was cut down while his body was still warm, he was drawn and quartered, and his bowels were taken out and burned.

Lack of Individual Freedom. — What with royal regulation, town and gild, and Church regulation, the individual had very little freedom. It was natural that children should not escape. "A child were better to be unborn," it was said, "than to be untaught," and numerous rhymed treatises were composed for their guidance. The boy was directed what to do from the time he got up in the morning till he went to bed at night; how he should dress; how he should eat; how he should act on his way to school — he was to greet passersby, not to throw stones at hogs and dogs, not to run away birds-nesting — how he should act in school if he got there. Equally minute were the directions to girls.

Eating and Drinking and Recreations. — Eating and drinking were most immoderate, and only the open-air life and exercise made it possible for medieval English folk to digest the huge quantities they consumed. They had no tea or coffee and little fresh meat or vegetables, now regarded as necessities. Yet their fare was not coarse and simple. Medieval cookbooks and kitchen utensils show that there were all sorts of dishes highly spiced, complicated, and delicate. Nevertheless, they relished many things that would hardly tempt the modern palate, such as hedgehogs, swans, peacocks, rooks, porpoises, and sparrows. Fast days meant merely a change from meat to fish. Ale was the drink of the lower classes, while kings and nobles regaled themselves on costly wines from abroad, varied by numerous elaborate concoctions such as mead and posset. Because of defective means of lighting, meals were still very early, and owing to the heavy drinking, not infrequently were nothing more than carousals which broke up in fighting that sometimes proved fatal. Yet there were many peaceful diversions: the tales of knights who had journeyed or fought in France or the Holy Land, songs of minstrels, feats of jugglers, and dancing. There were games too for young and old, though the chief resource of women was spinning, weaving, embroidery, and sewing,

while the men devoted much of their time to hunting and hawking. Chivalry was greatly fostered by the custom of sending young boys and girls to serve as pages or maids at Court or at the castles of great nobles. There the page learned the code of gentleness and courtesy which were the ideal of the medieval knight.

Warfare. — The two great innovations in the method of conducting war under the Edwards were the long bow and cannon with gunpowder: the former, first used in the Welsh and Scotch wars of Edward I, won a European renown at Crécy and Poitiers. The fatal cloth-yard shaft could not only break up a charging squadron by killing or wounding the imperfectly protected horses, but penetrated the joints of the horseman's armor or, if it struck fair, even the plate itself. In seeking to meet this danger by thickening the plate, the armor became so unwieldy as to incapacitate the wearer, for an unhorsed knight could not rise without help and often he was stifled by the sheer weight of his own defense. Gunpowder supplemented the long bow in overthrowing the old system. While the assertion that cannons were used by the English at Crécy has not passed without question, Edward III probably employed them at Calais, though it was some time before they became effective in sieges, and still longer before they played any part in field engagements.

Travel. — In spite of the badness of roads and bridges there was much traveling in fourteenth-century England. The King, the nobles, and bishops made stately progresses, accompanied by imposing retinues of horsemen, and dealt havoc with the goods of the lesser folk, who at their approach fled to hide their fowls and eggs and such other produce as their lords might seize. Merchants traveled about to buy and sell at the various fairs and staple towns, and abbots and monks journeyed from monastery to monastery on business connected with their orders. Most of the better sort rode on horseback. Luggage and goods too were carried on horses and mules, though great ladies were beginning to use litters and carriages, cumbersome and gorgeously ornamented, while the mass of the people traveled on foot. There were peddlers who supplied the country folk, there were strolling players, minstrels, and jugglers. On great occasions the minstrels flocked together from every part of western Christendom: at the marriage of Edward I's daughter, for instance, no less than four hundred and twenty-six were present. Some, of course, were regularly attached to royal and baronial households, and in many cities there were gilds or brotherhoods, formed for "well-ordered gaity," with rules for membership, singing contests, and processions. Most of the singers, however, were wandering vagabonds who combined tumbling and

sleight-of-hand performances with minstrelsy, and were often newsmongers, spies, and stirrers up of revolt.

Beggars, Friars, and Pilgrims. — In addition, there were hosts of beggars and wandering laborers whom the statutes failed to check. More numerous still were those who claimed to be servants of God and the Church; even the hermits no longer sought solitary places but settled along frequented roads to ask alms of the passersby. The strolling friars were as great a nuisance as any. Once they had rendered manful service in the care of the poor and the formation of education; but the majority had become lazy and corrupt: they thrust themselves as guests on the houses they passed, eating and drinking, immoderately; they acted as venders of news and small wares; and encroached upon the parish priest by assuming the right to confess members of their flocks. Besides the friars there were the pardoners who sold remission of sins and supported their claims by exhibiting curious relics of doubtful pedigree. The roads were also crowded with pilgrims on their way to or from some holy place. The most popular shrine in England was that of St. Thomas at Canterbury; but many went even to Rome or the Holy Land. While the professional pilgrim or palmer enjoyed various privileges beside the hope of divine favor — he was exempt from tolls, his person was protected, and he received free food and shelter along the road — others in course of time joined in pilgrimages from varying motives. "Some went like gypsies to a fair, to gather money; some went for the pleasure of the journey, and the merriment of the road." They told of the marvelous relics they had seen; furthermore, like other strollers they were welcomed as bringers of news and letters. In spite of the superstition and trickery which they fostered, pilgrimages were of intense value — they drew people together, broke down local prejudice, spread news and civilization, fostered commerce, and gave a holiday to many who would have got it in no other way.

Accommodation for Travelers. — Travelers were accommodated in different ways. The King and his retinue might be billeted on the inhabitants of places along their road. Monasteries dispensed hospitality to all classes, frequently having a guest house outside the walls for the humbler folk. In many towns there were lodgings, the keepers of which were employed by the burghers to lure customers to them. In the country there were vacant buildings where merchants got shelter for the night, providing their own food and bedding — hence called "cold harbors." The inns were patronized chiefly by merchants. Although numerous enough they were not overcomfortable or clean. Moreover, the landlords were not infrequently suspected of being in

league with robbers, and, when not so bad as that, were often guilty of trickery and extortion, a favorite device being to draw guests into ordering more than they had money to pay for and then to seize their baggage and clothes. The inns were favorite resorts for the less reputable classes who spent their time drinking, gossiping, and gaming. By the roadside and in the smaller villages were alehouses, advertised by a stake or a bush projecting over the door. They furnished no lodging, and were often kept by women — " alewives " — who had a bad reputation for cheating both in money and measure. Under such conditions hospitality was regarded as a great virtue, and was general, from the lord of the manor to the poorest cotter.

Public Health, Medicine and Surgery. — As in the past, lack of fresh food, unsanitary conditions, and inadequacy of transportation were the cause of famine and epidemics. In 1315 heavy rains wrought destruction with the harvest, causing such pressure of hunger that not only horses and dogs but, it is said, children were eaten, and felons in jail tore one another to pieces, while, in 1322, there was another visitation of famine and disease when fifty-five poor persons in London were crushed to death in a scramble for food distributed at a rich man's funeral. All this occurred while the upper classes were living in luxury, though there was more splendor than comfort; for example, Edward III dismissed his Constable of the Tower because he had so neglected repairs that the rain came in on the bed of his sick Queen, and, in 1357, when his dead mother was brought to London for burial, the streets had to be cleared of filth for the passage of the body. Although the Black Death started a movement for better sanitation, the plague came back at least six times before the close of the century, causing the greatest destruction and demoralization, and preventing the natural recovery from the devastation of 1348–1349. The science of medicine and surgery was still in a primitive state, even if some progress was made during the century. Monks and Jews had been the first to practice the art of healing in England, and after the expulsion of the Jews the bulk of the practice fell to the monks, in spite of prohibition of papal bulls. Prayers, ceremonies, visits to shrines, astrology, charms, and spells were the commonly accepted means for curing ills; and were sometimes employed as adjuncts by the practitioner. The incorporation of the Barber Surgeons as gilds at London and York, toward the end of the century, worked an era in surgery.

Military and Domestic Architecture. — Castles, while they reached their highest degree of development in the time of the Edwards, came to be employed more and more exclusively as governmental and mili-

tary fortresses; yet, curiously enough, by the time the art of building them had been perfected, the introduction of cannon and gunpowder rendered them useless. Fortified manor houses largely replaced the old private castles, though the causes making for this change were at work long before the new implements of war were generally adopted. Since the time of Stephen the Crown had refused to tolerate private castles, except in rare instances, and had usually been strong enough to enforce its prohibitions. Moreover, the cessation of feudal warfare made them no longer necessary, and the upper classes preferred more comfortable dwelling places just strong enough to protect them against robbers and occasional disorders, although these manor houses were bare and inconvenient enough according to modern standards.

Ecclesiastical Architecture. — The prevailing style of church architecture during the period of the three Edwards was the so-called "decorated," an elaboration of the pointed Gothic or early English, distinguished particularly by the ornateness of its window traceries, but, with all its warmth and richness, lacking the dignified simplicity of the style which it displaced. In the reign of Edward III a new style began to appear, the perpendicular, which became dominant during the following century. In general, it was stiff, formal, and unadorned; nevertheless, while beautiful curves gave way to straight lines and angularity, elements of beauty were not wholly lacking. Two notable features which did much to relieve the prosaic bareness of the perpendicular were the magnificent roofs, both open timbered and vaulted, and the fine towers, even though they do not equal the spires which they replaced.

The Universities. — Following the trend of the times, the universities became more and more national, and English scholars ceased to migrate to the Continent in any considerable numbers. Oxford, though it long maintained its ascendancy over its younger rival, Cambridge, had troubles of its own to contend with. Friction with the townsmen was intense, often leading to open fighting; the faculty were often at odds among themselves; and the ill-feeling between students from different parts of the country, particularly north and south, was so acute as to lead to frequent secessions. While the higher ranks were represented the majority were from the lower walks of life, the poorest of whom supported themselves by the work of their hands or even begged on occasion. Below the universities there were, in connection with convents, grammar schools presided over by secular clerks, the convents receiving the fees and paying the teacher a stipend. The Inns of Court at London furnished training for the common lawyer.

Literature: Chronicles and Romances. — History was still mainly in the hands of the monastic chronicles; but the man who best voiced the chivalrous and martial ideals of the age of Edward III was Jean Froissart (1337–1410), whose *Chronicle* tells the story of the English feats in the Hundred Years' War with a richness and vividness of detail that has made the book a joy for all time. French metrical romances, telling of the wanderings of knights, good and valiant, of their deeds of daring in overcoming giants and paynims, of their succoring ladies in distress, and of their service to religion, continued to be very popular. Legends which had clustered about the names of mighty men of old time, Alexander, Charlemagne, and King Arthur, and the beautiful story of the search for the Holy Grail were among their chief subjects, most of them worked over from French originals in the new English speech which was shaping itself during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

Religious Literature and Plays. Ballads. — Alongside the knightly romance there grew up a mass of religious literature, mostly in verse, lives of saints, sermons, tracts, and epics, some of which aimed to entertain as well as to instruct and edify. More popular still were the religious plays. The earliest were the miracle plays — which dramatized Bible stories and the wonders wrought by saints. Beginning in certain ceremonies in the Church on such feast days as Easter, the mysteries were soon transferred to the churchyard and then to the town square, while, by the fourteenth century, they had passed from the hands of the priests to the gilds who gave annual exhibitions on Corpus Christi day. Usually each gild had a cart, drawn by apprentices, with a stage erected upon it. Each of these moving stages — known as "pageants" [1] — represented one scene of the story, and the whole sequence was known as a cycle. Somewhat later appeared the morality plays which dealt with the strife between good and evil rather than with theology. Vice, greed, innocence, indeed all sorts of human traits were personified. To these plays and to the royal pageants representing scenes from classic and medieval legend, such as the fight between St. George and the Dragon, may be traced the beginnings of the later drama. Christmas "mummings," too, were very popular, in which Old Father Christmas, Old King Cole, and the Merry Andrew came to be well-known figures; though, on other occasions, as well, mummers paraded the streets in grotesque masks, representing various animals, or dressed in the garb of beasts or satyrs with men's heads. Among a mass of ballads, many of them political in character, the best known are those which relate the deeds of the

[1] From this original meaning the term came to be applied to the play and then to any imposing spectacle.

legendary outlaw Robin Hood, who was supposed to have dwelt in Sherwood Forest, in the later twelfth century, protecting the poor and robbing their oppressors. His many adventures and those of Little John, Friar Tuck, and Maid Marian were also worked up into plays.

Geoffrey Chaucer (1340–1400). — The great name in the literature of the age, indeed one of the great names in the literature of the world, was that of Geoffrey Chaucer, "the father of English poetry." The son of a London vintner, he began life as a page in a princely household. His residence at the English court, the most brilliant in Europe, his travels in many lands, his associations with all sorts and conditions of men gave him rare opportunities of which his genius made the fullest use. Chaucer's early literary products appeared under the spell of the old French courtly romances. A diplomatic mission to Italy in 1372–1373 marked a crisis in the poet's life, for it was then that he came into the world of the Renascence, that marvelous revival of learning and outburst of literary and artistic creations which came to birth in Italian soil. There he learned to know the sublime vision of Dante, the exquisite poetic forms of Petrarch, and the tales of Boccaccio. It was the latter which may have determined the form of Chaucer's masterpiece and furnished him with some of the stories which he included in it. The result of his Italian sojourn is seen in various works which he produced after his return, among them *Troilus and Creseide*, described as "the first analytical novel in the English language." In his third or English period came the crowning achievement of Chaucer's life, the *Canterbury Tales*, told through the mouths of a body of pilgrims journeying from the Tabard Inn in Southwark to the shrine of Thomas Becket at Canterbury. The poet completed less than a quarter of his projected work; but he depicted the peculiarities of individuals representing various walks of life, the knight, the friar, the nun, the franklin, the physician, the Oxford scholar, the merchant, the miller, and many more, with a fidelity, a vividness, and a humor unsurpassed by any writer before or since. Writing in the tongue of the southeast Midlands he stamped that form upon the English to the very borders of Scotland and Wales; spreading as England grew into an Empire, the speech and writing of a considerable part of the world's population owes more to Chaucer than to any other single man.

John Gower and William Langland. — Of the works of John Gower, a contemporary of lesser note, the *Vox Clamantis*, containing an account of the Peasant Revolt, in 1381, and a severe denunciation of government and society of the time, is of the most historic interest. But the social unrest of this age and the outcry against the oppression,

folly, and vices of the ruling classes is best voiced in the *Vision of William Concerning Piers the Plowman*, sometimes attributed to William Langland. In the form of an allegory, written in a revival of the native alliterative verse, the *Vision* traces the exaltation of the common man, pictured as a simple rustic, until he becomes a mystical type of Christ. It lashes the sins of society and the individual, and preaches the gospel of man and the glory of work. In spite of its allegorical and abstract form, the descriptions are so concrete and vital that men and women seem to live and breathe before the reader.

Wiclif a National Champion. — While Piers Plowman aimed chiefly at men Wiclif struck at a system. It was his work to mold the grievances against the Church and the Papacy into tangible form. Since the Popes from 1305 to 1378 were settled at Avignon under French control, his opposition had a popular national color. Not only, however, did he oppose papal demands for money and papal claims to provide for English benefices, but he maintained that the Church should hold no property, because it hindered truly spiritual work. Hence, it was the duty of the State to take land and revenues which hampered the Church in the performance of its proper duties. Moreover, he contended that a Pope, if unrighteous or unworthy, lost his right to rule; and his decrees, if against the will of God, were of no binding force. When asked by Parliament whether, when the Kingdom was in danger of invasion, it could refuse, even against a papal order, to send money out of the realm, he replied that the Pope could only ask for money as charity, and, since charity begins at home, it would be folly to give in the present juncture.

Early in 1378, shortly after the arrival of the papal bulls against him, he was brought before the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London, acting as papal commissioners; but the Queen Mother, widow of the Black Prince, who had taken up his cause, sent a message forbidding them to pass sentence on him, while a body of London citizens, accompanied by a disorderly rabble, now that his unpopular champion, John of Gaunt, was no longer in power to support him, appeared menacingly before the archiepiscopal palace. The upshot was a simple request from his judges that Wiclif desist from discussing the points enumerated in bulls.

The Development of Wiclif's Views after 1378. — This very year, 1378, marked an advance far beyond his original position. Gregory XI had moved back to Rome from Avignon, and, on his death, two rival Popes were elected, one by the Roman party, and one by the French. The resulting struggle, known as the Great Schism, which rent the Church in twain, led Wiclif to question the authority of the Papacy

altogether. Nor did he stop with attacking the Church's form of government; but proceeded to strike a blow at her most central dogma, the doctrine of transubstantiation. According to the orthodox belief the bread and wine used in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper were transformed by the consecrating words of the priest into the very body and blood of Christ.[1] Wiclif did not go so far as some of the later Protestants and deny the Real Presence altogether; he maintained that after the bread and wine were consecrated they did not disappear, but that the body and blood of Christ came and dwelt in them. In other words, for transubstantiation he substituted consubstantiation. His doctrines, now too extreme for many, were twice condemned, and, though he was spared, his followers were persecuted rigorously. During his last years, spent in peaceful retirement, he wrote nearly all of his English works and revised his Latin works, which fill together nearly thirty printed volumes. He died 30 December, 1384.[2]

The Two Channels of Wiclif's Teachings. — Some years before his death Wiclif had devised two agencies to spread his teaching among the humbler folk. One was his "poor preachers," sent out, staff in hand and clad in coarse russet gown, to preach the simple truths of the Gospel. Those who accepted his teachings came to be known as Lollards. As an organized sect they did not long survive Wiclif's death: they were accused of socialism and held responsible for the Peasant Revolt; their doctrines shocked the orthodox; and the lowly character of their following excited the contempt of the great. Nevertheless, their work lived after them: they struck the first mortal blow at the Church of Rome in England, and they infused a spirit of earnestness into English life which reached its fruition in the Puritan Revolution nearly three centuries later; and the Queen of Richard II carried their teachings to Bohemia, where John Huss, the forerunner of Martin Luther, felt their influence. Wiclif's second agency was the translation of the Bible which he perfected, supervised, and assisted to carry out, though the bulk of the work was done by an associate, and after

[1] From the point of view of medieval "realist" philosophers the doctrine was more rational than it might seem to a modern Protestant; in their minds the reality or substance of a thing was not the visible attributes which could be seen, touched and handled, but an inner invisible essence. That was what was believed to change. Two good reasons explain why the Church fostered the belief in transubstantiation. It emphasized the human side of Christ, which certain of the early sects denied; and it exalted the priesthood, who were held in higher reverence from their ability to perform the miracle. It was to combat the sacerdotal power that Wiclif framed his view.

[2] In 1428, in accordance with a decree of the Council of Constance passed in 1415, his remains were dug up, burned, and cast into a neighboring brook.

Wiclif's death was revised and reissued in a completer form. Although not a stylist, Wiclif's achievements in spreading the Bible among the people exerted an influence which entitle him to be called the "father of English prose," for Chaucer wrote in verse. By suppressing the Bible the Government not only arrested the program of true religious thought, but the growth of English prose as well.

England a National State. — In the wars against France, in the struggle to control its own commerce and to develop native industries, in the conflict against the power of Rome, in the rise of a purely English literature, one great fact is evident; England had become a nation. As the barons, who, in the time of John and Henry III, fought selfishly against royal despotism and the exploitation of their country by foreigners, had unconsciously prepared the way for a constitutional monarchy, so they had, again unwittingly, taken the first steps to awaken a national spirit which first came to a full, conscious realization in the England of Edward III.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

For the constitutional aspects of the period the works already cited. Medley is particularly good on the development of Parliament.

For social, industrial and intellectual conditions in addition to the works already cited, *e.g.* in chs. V, X, J. E. T. Rogers, *A History of Agriculture and Prices* (6 vols., 1866–1867) and his *Six Centuries of Work and Wages* (1890) based upon it, both valuable but not to be relied upon implicitly. G. G. Coulton, *Social Life in Britain from the Conquest to the Reformation* (1918); G. E. Unwin, ed., *Finance and Trade under Edward III* (1918); L. F. Salzmann, *English Industries of the Middle Ages* (1914); E. L. Cutts, *Scenes and Characters in the Middle Ages* (1872); Jusserand, *English Wayfaring Life in the Middle Ages* (2d ed., 1889); Gasquet, *The Great Pestilence* (1893); Charles Creighton, *History of Epidemics in Britain* (2 vols., 1891–1894); R. L. Poole, *Illustrations of the History of Mediaeval Thought* (1884); A. F. Leach, *The Schools of Mediaeval England* (1915); E. K. Chambers, *The Mediaeval Stage* (1903); Robert Withington, *English Pageantry* (vol. I, 1919); W. H. Schofield, *Chivalry in English Literature* (1915).

For the Church see, W. W. Capes, *History of the English Church* (1903) and G. V. Lechler, *John Wiclif and his English Precursors* (2 vols., 1881–1884).

Gardiner & Terry

CHAPTER XIV

RICHARD II (1377–1399). THE END OF THE PLANTAGENET DYNASTY

A Boy King. Unsatisfactory State of the Country. — On 16 July, 1377, a boy of ten, Richard, son of the Black Prince, was crowned King. Although the reign began with a prospect of conciliation beween contending factions, nevertheless, Piers Plowman had prophesied truly that "where the cat is a kitten, the kingdom is full miserable." The pestilence and the long war had thinned the population and burdened the country with heavy taxes, while the English possessions in France had been reduced to marsh-girdled Calais and a portion of Aquitaine. Bands of armed men, wearing the livery of one or another great lord, roamed through England, plundering and disturbing the peace. In the face of suffering, danger, and disorder the Commons viewed with increasing resentment the luxury at court.

The Poll Taxes of 1379 and 1380. — The Government, chosen by the Parliament to act for the little King, proved ineffective and unpopular. Its war measures were particularly unsuccessful, yet in order to meet the expenses which they involved, poll taxes were devised. The first, levied in 1379, was carefully graduated according to wealth, but in a new assessment, imposed the following year, the burden fell more heavily on the lower classes, causing great "dismay and woe," and furnishing the occasion for a revolt which had been brewing for years.

Conditions Leading to the Peasant Revolt. — The widespread discontent was social and industrial as well as political. The peasantry were infuriated at the attempts since the Black Death to revive old villein services, and joined the artisans in strenuous opposition to the Statutes of Laborers. In the towns, the lesser folk chafed also at the selfish, arbitrary policy of the ruling bodies. Very generally municipal governments had passed into the hands of little oligarchies who governed with a total disregard of their unprivileged fellow-townsmen. Another grievance was the restrictive gild regulation which

bore with peculiar harshness on the unskilled laborers in preventing them from passing from one employment to another. Among other uneasy and discontented elements were soldiers released from the war and disinclined to work, while fugitive villeins, idlers, and criminals swelled the throng. Then there were the more extreme among the followers of Wiclif, though he himself had not sanctioned force. A "mad priest," John Ball, went about teaching that goods should be held in common and the distinction between lord and serf wiped away. However, the poll tax, received with "great grudging and many a bitter curse," was the spark that fired the train.

The Peasant Revolt (1381). — While the chief centers of disturbance were in the south and east, the revolt broke out nearly simultaneously in almost every part of the country. The name "Peasant Revolt," by which it was commonly known, is misleading. In Kent, for example, where no villeinage existed, the chief grievances were the poll tax and the maladministration. The plan was to kill all lords and gentlemen and great churchmen, to burn tax rolls and title deeds, to secure possession of the King, and to take the government into their own hands.

Outbreak in Essex and Kent. The March on London. — The first outbreak occurred in Essex, late in May, with the stoning of the royal tax commissioners. Within a few days the Kentishmen rose, choosing as leader one Wat Tyler, an obscure adventurer of ready wit and sharp tongue. Rapidly swelling in numbers the rioters started for London, burning houses of royal officials, lawyers, and unpopular landlords as they proceeded. On the evening of 12 June, they encamped on Blackheath; the same night the Essex insurgents, who had been busy destroying court and manorial rolls, reached Mile End; thus London was threatened from the north and east. The next morning John Ball preached a fiery sermon, declaring that in the beginning all men were equal, that the wicked had reduced them to servitude and that the time had come to shake off the yoke. Stimulated by his words, the insurgents streamed into the City, though with wise moderation they spared the property of all except their chief enemies.

The Conference at Mile End. — On the morning of the 14th, young Richard rode out to Mile End, northeast of the City walls, entering the howling mob, as a "lamb among wolves." However, they received him joyfully on bended knees, crying: "Welcome, our Lord King Richard, an it please you we desire no other King than you," whereupon, he heard their petition, presented by Wat Tyler, and granted every article. Their chief demands were: abolition of serfdom, full pardon to all insurgents, the right to buy and sell freely, fixed rents, and adjustment of wages by mutual agreement.

Excesses of the Rioters. Murder of Wat Tyler. — In spite of the royal concessions — which, as a matter of fact, Richard's councilors had no intention of carrying out — Wat Tyler led a band of rioters from the conference and sought out and cruelly murdered the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Treasurer, together with a few others whom they specially hated. Satisfied with what Richard had granted them, "the simple and honest folk" departed to their homes, while the extremists, the criminal, and the disorderly spent the night in slaughter, plundering, and burning. At a meeting, held next day to placate Tyler with further concessions, he was provoked into drawing his dagger and surrounded and cut down so promptly that it seemed as if the whole thing had been planned. When straightway the insurgents began to draw their bows, little Richard, so the story goes, showed himself a worthy son of the Black Prince; speeding toward them and waving them back he cried: "Sirs, will you shoot your King? I will be your chief and captain, you shall have from me all that you seek." While he delayed them in parley the Lord Mayor hastened to rally the citizens, and, with their aid, the King was more than a match for the rabble, demoralized by the loss of their chief. Yet he was wise enough to let them depart in peace, though he ordered Tyler's head to be fixed on London Bridge.

Suppression of the Revolt. Results. — The backbone of the resistance in London was broken. Kent submitted without fighting. The Essex insurgents demanded the confirmation of Mile End concessions; but King Richard led an army against them and put them down, declaring, regardless of his promises: "Villeins ye are still, and villeins ye shall remain." About a hundred of the rebels were tried and put to death, among them John Ball. Outside of Kent and Essex, risings in East Anglia caused the most trouble, those in other parts of the country were scattered and were suppressed by September. Parliament met in November. While all the King's promises were revoked, a general amnesty, excepting almost two hundred names, was proclaimed. Thus encouraged, many lords not only reasserted their rights, but tightened the bonds. While it is notable as the first great struggle of labor against capital, the Revolt of 1381 led to no startling changes. Serfdom, for example, was only gradually abolished, and this was due mainly to substitution of pasture for arable, and of leasehold farming for direct cultivation by manorial lords.

Royal Favorites and the Opposition (1382–1386). — Richard's education was very defective, awakening in him a love of luxury rather than of work. While Parliament sought to hold him in leading strings, self-seeking courtiers fed him with exalted notions of the royal powers

and urged him to throw off the parliamentary yoke. His chief favorites were, Robert de Vere, Earl of Oxford, and Michael de la Pole, later Earl of Suffolk — the former a person of mean attainments, the latter a trained general and diplomat whose aim was to make peace with France and to restore order by strengthening the royal authority. War with France dragged on languidly and fitfully, for Parliament would neither grant money for an adequate expedition led by the King in person, nor, though an occasional truce was made, would they accept peace on French terms. The conflict between the King and the Opposition was an unedifying one. While the issue was again raised of control of royal expenditure and the appointment of Ministers, the anti-Court party, among them two of the King's uncles, was more anxious for power than reform of abuses; on the other hand, Richard developed a fiery, headstrong temper and heaped favors upon his favorites. In 1386 he was forced to dismiss Suffolk, who, though the charges against him of subverting the laws and enriching himself with public money could not be sustained, was impeached and temporarily imprisoned.

The Lords Appellant (1387) and the Merciless Parliament (1388). — Richard refused to recognize a Council of Eleven set up by the baronial opposition in Parliament, and secured from the judges an opinion that such attempts to interfere with his prerogative were treasonable and that Parliament had no right to impeach his Ministers without his consent. Thereupon, both parties prepared for war, and, 14 November, 1387, a group of the opposition lords,[1] headed by Richard's uncle Thomas, Duke of Gloucester, "appealed of" or personally charged with treason five of the royal favorites, including de Vere and Suffolk. Richard, seeing that resistance was useless, advised them to save themselves and ultimately they all took flight. When a new Parliament met, in February, they ordered the arrest of the judges who had signed the opinion in favor of the King, and the "Lords Appellant" repeated their original appeal against the royal favorites supporting it by formal charges, which were, in substance: that the accused had conspired to estrange the King from his proper councilors, that they had raised an armed force, and had sought to massacre their opponents in Parliament. Suffolk and de Vere, beyond reach, died in exile, but two of the remaining three were executed, while a number of others, whose only crime was their faithful support of King Richard, were sentenced to death by this "Merciless Parliament" as it came to be called. The leaders enriched themselves with the offices and estates of their fallen enemies, and the Lords Appellant, who had been

[1] The accusing lords were known as the "Lords Appellant."

preaching economy all along, actually wrung a grant of £20,000 from Parliament for their services. With the appointment of Ministers from their own party and a Council to control the King their victory seemed complete.

Richard's Eight Years of Good Rule (1387–1396). — After less than a year of the new régime, Richard, by a sudden stroke, May, 1389, took over the government into his own hands. He was wise enough, however, not to put in office any of his old favorites and even to take no vengeance against the members of the Merciless Parliament. For eight years he ruled as a constitutional and popular King.

Richard in Ireland (1394–1395). — In 1394 Richard went to Ireland, the first King to visit the country since the time of John. There was much to demand his attention, for conditions were growing steadily worse. The "Pale"[1] had shrunk to a small bit of country about Dublin, and the other districts under English rule "were mere patches," cut off from it by native tribes who were constantly in revolt. In spite of the Statute of Kilkenny — passed in 1366, prohibiting the English from intermarrying with the Irish or adopting their language and dress — many of the original English settlers lived like the native Irish and their leaders ruled as independent tribal chiefs. Since Richard was accompanied by a large army, the Anglo-Irish and the Irish chiefs as well, thinking they could resume their old courses again after his departure, readily made their submission. He sought at once to dazzle them by his splendor and to attach them by his generosity: he published an amnesty for all past treasons both of the Englishry and the Irishry, he acknowledged that the harshness and corruption of his officials had caused much of the rebellion and disorder of the past, and took steps to reform the judiciary and general administration of the country.

Richard's Attempt to Rule as an Absolute King (1396–1398). — The death of Richard's Queen, Anne of Bohemia, in 1394, deprived him of a gentle restraining influence. In 1396 peace for thirty years was made with France and, in November of the same year, he married Isabella, the daughter of Charles VI. From the moment of this French alliance Richard began to throw aside all his recent caution and to nourish the most unrestrained ambitions — he increased the magnificence of his court, borrowed money right and left, resorted to all sorts of irregular and oppressive means to support his growing lavishness, and resisted with fury attempts at remonstrance. Suspecting that Lords Appellant were plotting against him, he had them seized and — in a packed Parliament which met in September, 1397 — "ap-

[1] The name of the area under English control.

pealed" them of treason for their acts of 1387–1388. All of them were speedily punished; their leader, Gloucester, shipped off to Calais, met his death on the way, probably murdered by royal order. Richard rewarded his supporters with unsparing hand, creating no less than five dukes and one marquis and four earls, and, before he allowed the members of Parliament to separate, he made them take an oath to maintain all the acts of the session.

Richard's Absolutism at Its Height. — The next year a new session was held at Shrewsbury, in which Parliament, overawed, it is said, by an armed force, passed measures that made Richard practically absolute. The acts of the "Merciless Parliament" were annulled; a subsidy on wool was granted him for life; and, this subservient body agreed to delegate its authority to a commission of eighteen for hearing petitions and transacting all undetermined business. Furthermore, Richard offended his subjects by the wildest statements: "The laws were in his mouth and in his breast," he declared, "not in any statute books," and "the lives and lands of his subjects were his own, to be dealt with according to his good pleasure, despite all legal forms." His foolhardiness during the next few months almost passes belief: he not only increased his exactions, but he accused whole counties of treason, he browbeat judges, and imprisoned hosts of persons on the slightest pretext. To cap his folly, he seized, on the death of John of Gaunt, the enormous estates of the family in defiance of a promise to Henry, John's eldest son, whom Richard, in consequence of a pending duel with another noble, had recently banished for ten years with the assurance that his rights of inheritance would be in no wise diminished. Indeed, he went further and exiled for life this man who stood next but one in line of succession to the throne.

The Landing of Henry of Lancaster 4 July (1399). — Having thus wronged his rival beyond endurance and fanned the anger of his subjects to a white heat, Richard departed for Ireland to chastise a rebel chief who had slain the Lord Lieutenant. While he was thus occupied, Henry of Lancaster landed, 4 July, 1399, at Ravenspur in Yorkshire. His following was small, but half of England had sent assurances that they were prepared to take up his cause. With solemn assurances he declared that he was not a traitor aiming at the throne; but that he came only to recover his paternal heritage and to drive away the "King's mischievous councilors and Ministers." Directly he heard the news Richard hastened back from Ireland, but his kingdom was practically lost before his arrival, and almost no one would fight for him. At length, in despair, he consented to surrender, and even to abdicate, on condition that his life should be spared and

that the followers who had stood by him should be given a safe conduct. Amid the hoots of the multitude he rode into London a prisoner.

The "Abdication" and Deposition of Richard (1399). — A Parliament was summoned, in his name, to meet 30 September, 1399; but before it came together he had read before Lancaster and other witnesses a document in which he declared himself, "insufficient and useless," and unworthy to reign. This abdication was repeated before Parliament, together with a list of articles setting forth at length the acts by which Richard had violated the constitution and oppressed individuals, among them the murder of Gloucester and the banishment and disinheriting of Henry of Lancaster. After the articles had been recited, both Houses voted that Richard should be deposed.

Henry of Lancaster Succeeds to the Throne. A Parliamentary Dynasty. — Thereupon, Henry of Lancaster rose and claimed the vacant throne — basing his claim on two grounds, right of descent from Henry III and right of conquest. As a matter of fact Henry's claim of descent was merely a pretext.[1] His second claim was the decisive one. Parliament chose him because, as the ablest male of the royal house, he had overcome a King who had defied the laws and oppressed the subjects. This action was fraught with the deepest constitutional significance. It confirmed the precedent, in the case of Edward II, that kings could be deposed for misrule, and established a new one — that Parliament could choose a successor not necessarily the next in blood. The further fact that, as elective kings, the Lancastrians made a bargain to govern in accord with the will of Parliament was also of the profoundest importance.

End of Richard. Final Estimate. — Richard, in February, 1400, was reported dead. According to some accounts he declined food and pined away, though more likely he was starved to death by his captors. Little fitted by training and disposition for his royal duties, his heritage from his grandfather had been a burdensome one, "debt, unlucky wars, popular discontent"; but he lived all that down and ruled for years as a constitutional and popular King. Then he suddenly plunged into a mad career of violence against his enemies, of extravagance, "vain boasting," "and freakish tyranny." His

[1] The Earl of March (see table, introd.) was actually the nearest lineal heir, since his grandfather had married Philippa, daughter of Lionel, Duke Clarence, second son of Edward III, while Henry by blood was one degree removed from the line of descent, since his father, John of Gaunt, was a younger brother of Lionel. In going back to Henry III, Lancaster was impliedly making use of a rumor spread by his followers that Edmund of Lancaster, the founder of his house, was really Henry III's eldest son whom Edward I had supplanted.

wrongs to Lancaster merely furnished the occasion and the leader to overthrow him.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

Narrative. Ramsay; Vickers; and C. W. Oman, *Political History of England* (1906), a good clear account but marred by many inaccuracies of detail. For the Peasant Revolt see Oman, *The Great Revolt of 1381* (1906); and G. Kriehn, "Studies in the Sources of the Social Revolt of 1381," *American Historical Review*, VII, 254–285, 458–484.

Selections from the sources, Adams and Stephens, nos. 84–103.

CHAPTER XV

THE HOUSE OF LANCASTER IN THE ASCENDANT. HENRY IV (1399–1413). HENRY V (1413–1422) AND THE "CONSTITUTIONAL EXPERIMENT" IN GOVERNMENT

The Lancastrian Period. Its Constitutional Importance. — The Lancastrian régime of over sixty years was a period of wars at home and abroad, lightened by picturesque incidents, but, in general, dreary and inglorious. Yet this half century is notable for something more than the rise and fall of a royal family. Its real significance lies in the fact that Parliament, having put this family on the throne, exercised control over the affairs of the Kingdom all through the reign of Henry IV, Henry V, and well into the reign of Henry VI. Privileges which had been only occasionally asserted under previous Kings were now recognized, exercised, and extended. The parliamentary experiment proved premature; nevertheless, the experience was a valuable one which later bore enduring fruit.

Henry IV (1399–1413). Character and Problems. — Henry IV, sometimes known as Henry of Bolingbroke, from the place of his birth, was brave, active, temperate. By nature merciful, the bitter experiences of his later years made him suspicious and calculating, and when goaded by resistance and rebellion, cruel in retaliation. A good soldier, he was also a careful administrator and a wise statesman. The reign opened full of promise. Henry was welcomed by all classes, he was related to most of the great barons of the Kingdom, he was in close alliance with the Church and clergy, and pledged himself "to abandon the evil ways of Richard II," and to govern, not by his own "singular opinion," but "by common counsel and consent." Notwithstanding his seeming popularity his position was insecure and trying. His title might be taken away by those who gave it, and there were such demands upon his resources that he was always in debt. The French refused to recognize him as Sovereign and coveted the English possessions on their soil; Scotland was restless and Wales soon broke out into revolt. In addition, Henry was teased by his Parliaments and harassed by risings of the dis-

affected; he was the prey of factions; attempts were made on his life; and his last years were darkened by efforts of his son to supplant him, by the pains of illness, and by stings of conscience over his usurpation. Shakespeare could make him say with truth: "Uneasy lies the head that wears a crown."

The Beginning of a Welsh Revolt under Glendower (1400). — In the first year of his reign, besides an abortive plot to restore Richard, who soon ceased to live, and an ineffectual rising of the Scots, instigated by France, there was a more dangerous movement in Wales led by Owen Glendower, a Welsh squire, who, stung to revolt by failure to secure redress from the King against a grasping neighbor, obtained a great following of his countrymen, moved by resentment against English rule, the oppression of English officials, and the arrogance of the Lords Marchers. Year after year English armies marched against him, but Owen always eluded them. He nourished vast plans for setting up a great Celtic empire; to that end he negotiated on all sides — with the Irish, the Scots, the French, the Pope, and with disaffected English barons who wanted to seat the young Earl of March, Richard's next heir, on the throne. All his ambitious designs came to naught, though for years he lived as an outlaw, a local terror to the Lords Marchers. He finally died, in 1415; but the common people, among whom he was reputed to be a wizard, long dreamed that Owen Glendower only slept and would finally awake to deliver them from the English yoke.

The Risings in the North. — In the early stages of his revolt he had counted on the Percies who ruled in the north with almost kingly power. Henry, the elder, Earl of Northumberland, who with his fiery son Sir Henry, known as "Hotspur," had aided to put the King on the throne, were richly rewarded and intrusted with the defense of the Scotch and Welsh borders. In spite of scanty supplies from the royal purse, they executed their duties effectively, and inflicted a crushing defeat on an army of Scotch invaders in 1402. The result, however, was a deadly quarrel with their Sovereign over the payment of expenses incurred and the disposal of the prisoners. Hotspur opened communications with Glendower, and marched an army to join his Welsh ally. Hastily levying an army, the King marched to the Welsh border, and, 20 July, 1403, attacked his enemies at Shrewsbury before they could effect a junction with Glendower. The rebel forces were routed and Hotspur was killed. Northumberland, who had been raising an army in Yorkshire, disbanded it on the news of the royal victory and begged for pardon. Very foolishly the King let him off with a short imprisonment; whereupon, in 1405,

the unquiet Earl, united with a number of great lords in another rising, eluded capture, and was a constant source of trouble until, in 1408, he was defeated and slain in leading a raid from Scotland across the Border. England had no occasion to fight another battle on her own soil for forty years.

Henry's Last Years (1408–1412). — Henry was now supreme. Owing to the efficient campaigns of his son, Prince Hal, the Welsh from this time ceased to be dangerous; James, King of Scotland, captured by English privateers on his way to France, was a prisoner; while France — under Charles VI, a King subject to frequent fits of insanity and torn by party strife between the houses of Orleans and Burgundy — was only too glad to keep peace. Still Henry's last years were not happy. He suffered from grievous bodily infirmities, his usurpation and the deaths of Richard and of Archbishop Scrope — whom, against his better judgment, he allowed to be tried and executed for joining in the rising of 1405 — weighed heavily on his conscience, and he was much distressed at the impatience of Prince Hal, egged on by his ambitious uncles, to grasp the reins of government. Nevertheless, at his death, 20 March, 1413, this much-tried King left behind him a strong government and an uncontested title.

Constitutional and Parliamentary Gains. — However, it is from the constitutional point of view that the reign is most significant, for owing to Henry's necessities, Parliament secured the dominance in public affairs which they retained during the greater part of the Lancastrian period and which furnished a model to future generations. In successive sessions they established the principle that redress of grievances should precede supply, that moneys should be voted only on the last day of the session after their petitions had been answered; they asserted successfully the right of freedom of debate; and — often with scant justice — they cut down or revised the expenditures. For example, in 1406, we find them demanding redress of "good and abundant grievance" and telling their Sovereign that his household was composed not of "valiant and sufficient men but of rascalry"; they appointed a commission to audit all public accounts, while, furthermore, they forced the King to agree that he would do nothing without the consent of a continual Council of their own choosing.[1] In 1407 they secured recognition of the important principle that money grants should originate in the Commons.

[1] Had this scheme remained permanent the present Cabinet system would have been anticipated by many centuries.

Measures against the Lollards. — Parliament, too, passed cruel and searching acts against the Lollards, though the initiative came from the clergy and the King, for Henry IV, from policy, and his son, from conviction, were both very orthodox. In 1401 the important statute *de haeretico comburendo* was enacted, providing that impenitent heretics, after conviction by the ecclesiastical courts, should be handed over to the lay authorities to be burned, "in order to strike terror into the minds of others." An Act passed in 1406 accused the Lollards of denying rights of property and of preparing men's minds for rebellion, and provided that all who were detected teaching or defending any Lollard doctrine were to be arrested as public enemies. In 1409 the Archbishop of Canterbury issued a series of constitutions condemning the doctrines of Wiclif, forbidding the translation of the Bible without authority, and prohibiting all discussion upon points determined by the Church. "An execrable crowd of Lollard knights," "true satellites of Pontius Pilate," in the Parliament of 1410, replied with a petition that the enactments against heretics might be softened, and even proposed a complete disendowment of the Church. As might be expected, the King refused to listen, and Prince Henry "bade them never for the future dare to put such stuff together." Parliament was progressive in politics, in religion the orthodox party was in the majority. The King identified himself with both tendencies.

Henry V (1413–1422). Accession and Character. — Henry V, while he had already distinguished himself in the Welsh wars and had had considerable experience in government, had been a wild and boisterous youth. His accession changed him into another man, reputed the "most virtuous and prudent of all the princes reigning in his time." Rigidly attached to the Church, he has been blamed for his relentless persecution, but he believed, with the best minds of the age, that heretics should be made to recant for their own salvation or disposed of to prevent them from contaminating others. Moreover, the Lollards menaced the existing social order, joined in conspiracies against him, and leagued with his enemies.[1] He lived in a grim age, and when he awoke to his responsibilities, became frugal, cautious

[1] The suppression, in 1414, of a rising by Sir John Oldcastle, persecuted for holding Lollard opinions, was followed by the hanging of thirty of his adherents as traitors and the burning of seven as heretics. Parliament, in the same year, passed another heresy act providing that any of the King's officers might seize suspected persons and hand them over to the Church courts for trial. Oldcastle escaped and wandered about as a proscribed outlaw, intriguing with the King's enemies, until 1417, when he was captured and burned. The failure of his efforts marked the end of Lollardry as a political and social force.

and active, devoid of geniality and gentleness, though not of justice, a man to follow and obey, not to love. It was from his exploits in the struggle against France that Henry V achieved his greatest fame. To recover English prestige and to regain territory which he believed to be rightfully his, as well as to unite his subjects in a common undertaking, he renewed the war with France. All that he set out to do he accomplished; he not only made himself supreme in France and awakened a genuine national enthusiasm at home, but came to be regarded as the first Monarch in Europe. His success, however, rested on foundations that could not prove lasting, on his personal prowess, and on the temporary weakness of France.

Henry Resumes the War with France (1414). — Taking advantage of the disordered mental condition of Charles VI and of the factional strife in France, Henry V undertook to restore the English prestige in France to the highest point which it had reached under Edward III, and if possible to recover all the territory which his predecessors had possessed. Furthermore, he concluded to reassert Edward III's claim to the French crown, or, as an alternative, to demand in marriage Katherine, daughter of Charles VI. As the Orleanists, led by the Count of Armagnac, were momentarily in control of the French King, he allied himself with the rival Burgundian faction, and, 31 May, 1414, sent ambassadors to demand the "restitution of his ancient rights." Since, however, the French could concede no terms which he would accept, he made ready to invade their country.

The Invasion of France (1415). Agincourt (25 October). After he had completed his preparations, Henry was delayed by the discovery of a new plot to put the Earl of March on the throne during his absence. Having made an example of the chief conspirator,[1] he set sail, 10 August, 1415, with an army consisting of about 2000 men at arms and 6000 archers. Owing to the coldness of the season and the fact that nearly half his forces fell sick, he was obliged to give up his original plan of systematically conquering Normandy, and decided to return home by way of Calais, hoping to overawe the inhabitants along the march and to tempt the enemy to battle. At Agincourt a force three or four times his own assembled to block his advance; again, as at Crécy and Poitiers the French were overcome by deadly clouds of arrows shot from the English long bows, and Henry, after three or four hours, gained an overwhelming victory with a loss of little more than 100, while the French left nearly 6000 dead on the field. In November he sailed from Calais. Aside from impressing his opponents with his daring and skill as a general, and

[1] March, himself, who disclosed the plot, was spared.

reviving the glory of English arms, he had gained little from his costly expedition.

Henry's Second Expedition to France (1417). — On 23 July, 1417, Henry embarked on his second expedition to France with an army twice the size of his first. He spent more than a year in reducing the strong places of Normandy; Rouen, which offered the most obstinate resistance, holding out from 29 July, 1418, to 19 January, 1419. Although he entered into negotiations with both the Orleanists and the Burgundians, his terms were so extreme that the two factions patched up a peace "to resist the damnable enterprises of our ancient enemies, the English." But the Dauphin, Charles, a boy of sixteen, under the thumb of the Orleanists, used this agreement merely as a decoy for the destruction of the Burgundian leader, John the Fearless, who was lured to a conference and slain as he was kneeling to do homage to his royal cousin. The result of this base crime was to throw the Burgundian party in the arms of the English, and to make effective resistance out of the question. So, 21 May, 1420, Charles VI, who was momentarily lucid, signed the "very marvelous and shameful" Treaty of Troyes, by which Henry V was recognized as heir of the King of France and Regent, and was promised the Princess Katherine in marriage, while "Charles, who calls himself the Dauphin," was formally disinherited "for his enormous crimes." Henry, who spent the next few months in reducing Orleanist strongholds, marred his triumph by steadily increasing cruelty and arrogance — he deliberately put prisoners to death to terrify those still in arms, and, on his entry into Paris, in December, he alienated the citizens by his overbearing manners. Late in the same month he returned to England after an absence of three and a half years, but the brief time that he remained in the country he devoted more to pageants and progresses than to affairs of State.

Henry's Third and Final Expedition to France (1421–1422). — Henry departed, 10 June, 1421, on his third and final expedition to France, with the object of crushing the Dauphin and his Orleanist adherents. He drove the Dauphin south of the Loire; and then undertook the reduction of the few strongholds which still held out; but the strain and hardship of the winter were too much for his already overtaxed strength. In July he was obliged to take to his bed and died 31 August, 1422. Before his death he made arrangements for carrying on the government during the minority of his infant son, born to him 6 December, 1421. He appointed his brother, John of Bedford, Regent of France, and Humphrey of Gloucester, his younger brother, Regent of England. These arrangements proved no more

stable than his conquest of France. The glamour of his military achievements must not blind us to the fact that Henry V had plunged his country into a war in which permanent success was hopeless, and which was largely responsible for the disorders and confusion in which his royal line went down to destruction.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

See Chapter XVI below.

CHAPTER XVI

THE FALL OF THE HOUSE OF LANCASTER. HENRY VI (1422–1461)

The Council and the Parliament Set Aside the Will of Henry V. — There was the greatest difference imaginable between the two brothers to whom Henry V had intrusted the government of England and France. Bedford was a high-minded man, devoted to public duty, while Gloucester, clever and cultivated, the patron of scholars, and at the same time master of the arts which please the people, was self-seeking and unprincipled, constantly stirring up dissension at home and abroad. Distrusting him from the start, the Council and Parliament set aside the will of the late King and declared Bedford Protector of the Realm, though they allowed Humphrey to act in that capacity during his elder brother's absence. As a matter of fact, however, the real powers of government were exercised by the Council, which was nominated by Parliament.

Two Kings of France. — On 21 October, 1422, the poor mad King Charles VI followed Henry V to the grave. The party of the Dauphin at once proclaimed him King as Charles VII, while the English party proclaimed little Henry. France was exhausted and demoralized, and Charles, weak and pleasure loving, the tool of worthless and ruffianly councilors, seemed totally unequal to the great task imposed upon him. Slowly, however, national sentiment was gathering against the foreign conquerors who had brought so much misery upon the land.

The Siege of Orleans (1428–1429). Jeanne d'Arc. — In the late summer of 1428 Bedford sent an army against Orleans, the chief stronghold which acknowledged Charles VII. Having failed to take the town by assault, the English determined to reduce it by famine, and a siege began which lasted from October, 1428, to April, 1429. For the French the outlook was of the gloomiest; their armies had been driven off the field and a complete triumph for the English seemed assured. Suddenly, 6 March, 1429, a simple maid, barely turned seventeen, appeared before the French King at Chinon, inspired, she told the doubting and astonished Court, by a divine com-

mission to relieve the sorely pressed Orleans and to lead her royal master to Rheims to be crowned. Jeanne d'Arc was a peasant girl of Domremy, who, always devout and imaginative, had begun about her thirteenth year to see visions of saints and angels, and to hear mysterious voices which at length directed her to go forth and save France. Securing the half-willing support of the commander of a neighboring garrison, she put on a man's doublet and hose, mounted a horse, and rode straight to Chinon, where she easily singled out the King from a group of courtiers, and, in a secret interview, told him things that made him trust her mission. Clad in armor and girt with a "miraculous, holy sword," the "Maid of God" went forth to raise the siege of Orleans. Inspired by her advent, the garrison put the besiegers to flight, and defeated the forces sent to support them. To the French she was a God-given deliverer, to Bedford "a disciple and limb of the fiend . . . that used false enchantments and sorcery."

Two Coronations (1429). — Having raised the siege of Orleans, Jeanne d'Arc led Charles to Rheims, and his coronation, 17 July, 1429, marked the height of her meteoric achievement. From now on voices ceased to guide her, and she devoutly wished that the Lord "would take her back to her father's sheep"; nevertheless, she advised an immediate advance on Paris and demanded that Burgundy make peace with his King. The Duke refused to comply, a belated and ill-considered attack on the city was repulsed, and the self-seeking courtiers were able to recover their ascendancy over the feeble-minded Charles. As a reply to the coronation at Rheims, little Henry, although not eight years old, was crowned at Westminster, 8 November, and, during the ceremony, "beheld the people all about sadly and wisely," and behaved with "great humility and devotion."

The Burning of Jeanne d'Arc (1431). — In May, 1430, Jeanne d'Arc was captured by the Burgundians. Sold to the English, she was taken to Rouen and tried in February of the following year. In vain she protested that "she had done nothing save by the command of God." For three months she was bullied and ill-treated by judges and jailers, to whom her simple courage and transparent honesty made no appeal, until finally, worn out by suffering, she was forced to declare that "her voices were delusions and that she had sinned in putting on men's clothes and going to war." She was burned in the market place at Rouen, 29 May, 1431. Yet, thanks to her inspired leadership, France was startled from her lethargy, and the "Maid of God" had been in her grave scarcely more than twenty years before her countrymen had driven the English from the land.

Turn of the Tide in France. Death of Bedford (1435). — For the moment Bedford seemed triumphant. In December, 1431, Henry was taken to Paris and crowned; but one reverse after another followed, far from balanced by occasional gains. Bedford, whose last years were plagued by efforts to hold Burgundy to the English alliance and to quiet strife stirred up by his uneasy brother Humphrey in England, died in 1435, worn out by his arduous duties. Although stout and experienced generals survived him and young leaders of promise were coming to the front, his death was an irreparable loss to the English. Burgundy now finally went over to the French side, while the English, fighting with stubborn courage and persistency, steadily lost ground, until, in November, 1437, the French King once more entered Paris which his forces had recovered the previous year. Humphrey of Gloucester, free from his brother's restraint, led the English war party, while his uncle, Cardinal Henry Beaufort, led those who favored peace; but, in 1441, the waning influence of the former abruptly ceased when his wife, Eleanor, was arrested, together with an astrologer and a woman, known as the Witch of Eye, on charges of reading the stars to determine the life of the young King, and then of endeavoring to destroy him by melting over a slow fire a waxen image made in his likeness. Her accomplices were put to death and the Duchess Eleanor was made to do penance by walking for three days about the City robed in a sheet and bearing a candle in her hand, and also sentenced to imprisonment for life. Absurd as these charges now seem, she was doubtless guilty of aiming to secure the succession of her husband, who was Henry's next heir in the Lancastrian line. Gloucester, who lacked courage to take any part in the affair, had to yield to the Beaufort faction, and, aside from obstructing them whenever he could, spent most of the remaining six years of his life collecting books and posing as a patron of learning.

Henry's Marriage to Margaret of Anjou (1444). — As Cardinal Beaufort was growing old, the conduct of affairs fell more and more into the hands of his nephew Edmund, Duke of Somerset, and of the Duke of Suffolk, the latter of whom, in 1444, at the cost of a secret truce ceding Maine and Anjou, negotiated a marriage between Henry VI and Margaret of Anjou, niece of Charles VII. This fiery young woman, an absolute contrast to her pious, kindly, and weak consort, joined the Beaufort-Suffolk faction, and accumulated a host of enemies, almost from the moment of arrival in England.

Richard, Duke of York. His Claim to the Throne. — Richard, Duke of York, who came to the front about this time as the leader

of the party opposed to the Queen, derived his dukedom through his father, from one of the younger sons of Edward III. From his mother he inherited a title to the Crown better than that of King Henry, since he was descended from Lionel, Duke Clarence, an elder brother of John of Gaunt.[1] Parliament, however, had declared for the younger line which had the further advantage of unbroken descent through males. In spite of his political activity, it was some years before Richard asserted his claims to the throne; indeed, he might never have done so, but for Henry's inability and misfortunes.

The Impeachment of Suffolk (1450). — As soon as the news of the cession of Maine and Anjou became known, a storm of abuse descended on the head of Suffolk, and when Somerset, sent over as Commander in 1448, was forced within two years to yield the whole of Normandy, the opposing faction in England, who attributed his continued ill success to treason, vented their fury by impeaching Suffolk. He threw himself on the King's mercy, and Henry ordered him to leave the kingdom for five years. On his way abroad his ship was intercepted and he was murdered by persons unknown.

Jack Cade's Rebellion (1450). — Popular discontent was manifested in "Jack Cade's Rebellion," which broke out in Kent and Sussex in May and lasted for six weeks. The grievances complained of were mainly political, the losses in France, the miscarriage of justice, and the wasting of the King's treasure. One social grievance alone was mentioned, the Statute of Laborers, and this was probably to secure the lower classes. The insurgents, who, having taken possession of London, put some of the officials to death and sacked the houses of the leading citizens, were soon driven from the City and induced to disband by false promises of pardon. Cade, their leader, was killed in struggling against arrest; many of those who had risen with him were executed, and various scattered revolts were crushed.

Richard of York and the War of the Roses. — Richard became a popular champion in consequence of his opposition to the unpopular Somerset, whom Henry had made Constable on his return from his disastrous campaign in France, and a proposal to declare him heir to the throne, which resulted in a speedy dissolution of Parliament by royal command, was the first intimation of the dynastic struggle between the Lancastrians and the Yorkists, known as the War of the Roses.[2] Yet some time elapsed before Richard himself asserted

[1] See table, introd.

[2] The name is not strictly correct, however, for while the white rose was the symbol of the Yorkists, the red rose was not a Lancastrian symbol. It was first used by Henry Tudor at Bosworth, in 1485.

his claims, and the actual war did not break out till 1455. Although the question of the succession came to be the most prominent issue, other causes contributed to bring it forward and to determine the final result: Henry's incapacity; the masterful intriguing character of his wife; the ill success of the war; the acute financial situation; the discontent and disorder throughout the land; and the jealousies of the great nobles who ranged themselves on the side of Somerset and Yorkist families respectively.

The Critical Year (1453). End of the Hundred Years' War.—The year 1453 witnessed events of the greatest consequence. Turning their armies south from Normandy, the French — although the English fought valiantly and were loyally supported by the Gascons — conquered Guyenne, and the Hundred Years' War was over. The impossible task of conquering France, begun by Edward III, and revived so brilliantly by Henry V, was at length abandoned, and England retired from the contest retaining only Calais of her former broad territories across the Channel. In August, King Henry was suddenly bereft of his faculties, and for sixteen months he continued in a helpless state. Although Richard's prospects of succession were dashed by the news that Margaret, 13 October, had given birth to a son, he managed to get control of the government; for Parliament, which met attended by armed retainers of the rival factions, declared him "Protector and Defender of the Realm," with all the powers of Regent.

The Battle of St. Alban's and the Beginning of the War of the Roses (1455).—When all seemed going well, the King's recovery of his reason on Christmas Day, 1454, reopened the old strife. Richard and his supporters were removed from office and Somerset gained the ascendancy. The Yorkists submitted to all this and retired quietly to their estates; but, when a Council was summoned to provide "for the safety of the King's person against his enemies," Richard gathered a following and marched toward London. Professing their loyalty, they demanded an audience with their Sovereign and the arrest of certain councilors of the opposite party, but they were refused a hearing, and 21 May, 1455, Somerset marched from the City with the King and a great following of lords. The two armies met in the ancient monastic town of St. Albans. The encounter which followed was little more than a street fight, but it was big in consequence, for it opened the War of the Roses. The Duke of Somerset was killed, and the Queen now came forward as the head of the royal party. The civil war, thus begun, waged intermittently for fifteen years.

BORMAY & CO., ENGR'S, N.Y.

The Yorkists in Exile. — The "ill-day of St. Albans," however, was followed by more than four years of comparative peace, though hatreds were bitter, private feuds were waged unsuppressed, and the Queen was busily courting the aid of the Scots and the French. By the summer of 1459, both parties were again arrayed in arms; but, for the time being, the royalist forces were too strong for the Yorkists, most of whom either disbanded or deserted to the enemy. Richard fled to Ireland, while his son Edward, Earl of March, together with a faithful supporter, the Earl of Warwick, risked a wild ride through a hostile country and crossed over to Calais. However, the government of the triumphant Lancastrians, with the poor King dominated by Margaret and a "covetous Council," proved weak and ineffective, and more and more in the face of poverty, disorder, and selfish faction, the hearts of the people were turned to the leaders in exile who might bring them relief.

Return of the Yorkists. Richard's Death at Wakefield (1460). — In June, 1460, Warwick and the Earl of March landed in Kent. Having issued a manifesto in which they set forth their grievances and the distempers of the realm, they proceeded to London, 2 July, whence, reënforced by musters streaming in from every side, they passed north and, at Northampton, defeated Henry VI and made him prisoner. Making no effort to crush Margaret, engaged in rousing the northern lords, they returned to London. Here they were joined by Richard, who had returned from Ireland in royal state, and who formally in Parliament claimed the crown as "heir of Richard II." Since this claim to succeed forthwith proved unacceptable even to his champion, Warwick, a compromise was arranged by which Henry was to remain King for life and Richard was to be recognized as his heir. Meanwhile, Margaret, after distressing hardships and harrowing adventures, had mustered a strong force in the north. Richard, underestimating her strength, marched against her with a small army and was defeated and slain at the battle of Wakefield, 29 December, 1460.

Warwick, the Kingmaker. — On the death of Richard of York, Richard Neville, Earl of Warwick, became the leader of the Yorkists, for the Duke's son, Edward, Earl of March, a youth of eighteen, was as yet distinguished for nothing save his strength, his beauty, and his great bravery. Warwick, though by no means preëminent as a general or as a statesman, was a skilled diplomatist and politician; moreover, he was first cousin to Edward, he was the greatest landowner in England, and dispensed lavish hospitality. Regarded as the leader of the party of reform and good government, he has, how-

ever, been very appropriately styled "the last of the barons"; for he was the last representative of a great noble family to exercise almost royal powers and powerfully to influence English history with hordes of armed retainers. Nor was he above the ambitions of his class, and the cry of reform which he raised and the movement which he led was really to secure more power for himself and his house. For that reason he ingratiated himself with the people by fair promises, and for that reason he now made, and strove later to unmake, a King.

Edward Becomes King of England (4 March, 1461). — After Richard's defeat and death, Margaret marched south to release her husband. While Edward was occupied with the Lancastrians in the west, she inflicted an overwhelming defeat on Warwick at the second battle of St. Albans, 17 February, 1461. Henry was rescued from his enemies; but, owing to his persuasions — for he was anxious to avoid more pillaging and bloodshed — Margaret did not march at once on London. While she was negotiating for its capitulation, Warwick and Edward, who had at length joined forces, pressed into the City and seized the fruits of her victory. Edward was declared King by a mass meeting of the citizens and the Yorkist lords. Though he was not legally elected, he took his seat on the throne at Westminster, 4 March, 1461, with the crown on his head and the scepter in his hand and received the homage of the magnates.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

(Chapters XV and XVI)

Mainly narrative. Sir James H. Ramsay, *Lancaster and York* (2 vols., 1892), pays particular attention to military and financial history; Oman, Vickers, and Stubbs, *Constitutional History*, previously cited. J. H. Wylie, *History of England under Henry IV* (4 vols., 1884–1898) is a scholarly exhaustive study. C. L. Kingsford's *Henry V* (1901) is a good brief biography. Kriehn, *The English Rising of 1450* (1892) throws new light on Cade's rebellion. K. H. Vickers, *Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester* (1907) is a full and scholarly account.

An authoritative work on an important aspect of constitutional development is J. F. Baldwin, *The King's Council in England during the Middle Ages* (1913).

Selections from the sources, Adams and Stephens, nos. 104–128.

CHAPTER XVII

THE YORKIST KINGS AND THE END OF THE WARS OF THE ROSES. EDWARD IV (1461–1483); EDWARD V (1483); RICHARD III (1483–1485)

The New King, Edward IV. — Margaret's army was so embittered and so discouraged that she was obliged to retreat northward. Edward and Warwick started in pursuit, and near Towton, on the high road to York, they overtook and defeated the Lancastrian forces in a bloody battle, 29 March, 1461. Henry and the Queen fled across the Scotch border, while Edward returned to London where he was formally crowned, 28 June. The Yorkist line had at length displaced its rival, and with its baronial supporters — whatever their motives as a self-styled party of reform — had overthrown a régime incompetent and corrupt enough in all conscience. The people, weary of disorder at home and disgusted at the losses in France, eagerly accepted a change in hopes of better things. Poor Henry had to give way to a stronger and more spirited ruler. Edward Plantagenet was described as the handsomest prince in Europe. He was jovial, hearty, and familiar with all sorts and conditions of people. Fond of pleasure and naturally indolent he was prone to trust to others. On the other hand, he had a streak of thrift which led him to keep his coffers filled by heavy exactions and profitable private trading, and likewise to foster the commerce and general prosperity of the country. At crises, too, he could rouse himself and act with great decision and vigor. As time went on, his worst qualities became more pronounced; his love of pleasure turned to viciousness and dissipation; he became cruel, bloodthirsty, and extortionate, and died at forty, worn out by self-indulgence.

Edward's Estrangement from Warwick (1464). — It was not till 1464 that Edward was fully master of England. In that same year he married Elizabeth, a widowed daughter of Richard Woodville. This step estranged the King's chief supporter, Warwick, for the Woodvilles were of the Lancastrian connection, and Edward, under the influence of his beautiful, ambitious wife, began to heap favors on her relatives at the expense of the Nevilles and other families who had

set the House of York on the throne. Moreover, Edward's unexpected action frustrated a plan which Warwick had had all but completed for marrying the English Monarch to the sister of Louis XI, who had succeeded Charles VII, in 1461. For the moment, however, the Earl swallowed his wrath.

King Henry Again a Prisoner (1465).—Meantime, the Scots had concluded a truce with England, and poor Henry, deprived of this asylum, had been lurking in one after another of the Lancastrian strongholds in the wild hill country between Yorkshire and Lancashire. In July of 1465 he was betrayed by one of his entertainers and taken to London. For five years he was kept a prisoner in the Tower, where, although neglected he was not really abused; for Edward was anxious to keep him alive as a hostage.

Edward Driven out of England. — Relations between Edward and Warwick — still further strained from the fact that, while the Earl adhered to Louis XI, the English King allied himself with Louis's arch-enemy Charles the Bold, Duke of Burgundy, to whom he gave his sister in marriage — reached a breaking point in 1469. Then a reconciliation took place which lasted less than a year. In 1470 a Lancastrian rising in Lincolnshire gave the King a chance to raise a great levy, to rout the insurgents, and to proclaim Warwick a traitor. Whether he was leagued with the insurgents is uncertain; but he had certainly promoted a revolt in Yorkshire the previous year, he resented Edward's refusal to follow his counsels, and may have nourished designs to seat the King's brother, the Duke of Clarence, on the throne. Hotly pursued he took refuge in France, where Louis XI succeeded in reconciling him to Margaret of Anjou, the Earl marrying his daughter Ann to Margaret's son, Prince Edward. Supported by the French King, Warwick landed on the south coast of England; the Nevilles rose in the north, and, deserted by the bulk of his forces, King Edward fled to Holland in October. Warwick marched to London and released Henry VI from the Tower. Bewildered, the half-demented King meekly assented to all that the Earl was pleased to do. While the people, as a rule, looked on with apathy, the majority accepted Warwick, though London resisted, under the lead of the merchants who were attached to Edward because he owed them money and because of their interest in the Flemish trade.

The Return of Edward and His Victory at Tewkesbury (1471).—A combination between Warwick and Louis XI against Burgundy forced Charles to equip Edward for an expedition to recover his throne. Landing on the east coast he hurried to London, secured the City, made Henry a prisoner again, and marched forth to attack Warwick

in a battle fought at Barnet, eleven miles north of London, 14 April, 1471, where the Earl's forces were defeated and he was slain as he attempted to flee. Forthwith Edward hastened west to intercept Margaret and her son, who, recently landed in Dorset, were marching up the Severn Valley gathering recruits. At Tewkesbury the Lancastrians were overwhelmingly crushed, 4 May, Margaret was taken prisoner,[1] and the Prince was either killed as he sought to escape or brought before the King and slain by his orders. On 21 May, Edward reached London in triumph, and shortly after, it was reported that Henry had died "of pure displeasure and melancholy," but there is little doubt that he was murdered in accordance with the royal will. Lacking in resolution and knowledge of human nature, he was ever the puppet of stronger natures, including his wife who contributed to his undoing, and his mind, always weak, broke down under the strain of the disorders of his kingdom that he was unable to avert. Pure, honest, merciful, and wholly deserving a more happy fate, he was long worshiped in the north country as a saint and martyr.

Edward's Rule after Tewkesbury and His Expedition to France. — Edward's restoration, due largely to his own remarkable generalship, was marred by extortion and cruelty: "the rich were hanged by the purse and the poor by the neck," while none dared oppose him. After having spent a large part of the confiscations wrung from his vanquished enemies, Edward called a Parliament. To secure grants he declared his intention of renewing war on France, and, in addition, exacted "benevolences," supposed to be voluntary, but usually forced from the unwilling subject. Although extravagant, he was careful enough not to exceed his revenues, and politic enough to pay his bills. After concluding a treaty of alliance with Charles of Burgundy, with the avowed object of recovering his "rightful inheritance" from the "usurper Louis" he led an army to France of nearly 15,000 men. On landing at Calais he found that Charles was not able to render him any assistance. However, Louis was willing to treat, and the two Kings met on the bridge of Pecquiny, near Amiens, separated from one another by a grating of trellis work. Louis agreed to pay down to Edward 75,000 gold crowns together with an annual pension of 50,000, also, a truce of seven years was arranged and a league of amity during life, each King binding himself to assist the other against his rebellious subjects.

Attainder and Execution of Clarence (1478). — Edward's brother, the Duke of Clarence, who had married a daughter of Warwick and

[1] She was later released on payment of a ransom by France and died in 1482.

had been the latter's tool from 1469 to 1471, when he finally deserted the Earl's cause, was constantly involved in quarrels with the King and with his other brother Richard, Duke of Gloucester. Edward had never trusted him after his attempted treachery, and, as the years went on, various causes of friction developed. In 1478 he was seized and thrown into the Tower and an act of attainder was passed, in a subservient Parliament, accusing him of spreading scandalous tales about the King, of compassing his death by necromancy, and of plotting an armed rebellion. Sentence was passed on him by a court of Peers. Worthless and false as Clarence was, the proceeding was a mere travesty on justice. Shortly after his condemnation he perished in the Tower, no one knows how, but the common story is that he was drowned in a butt of Malmsey wine. Although it rid him of a troublesome rival, the tragic fate of Clarence seems to have embittered the remainder of Edward's life.

Edward's Last Years. — After his profitable peace with France the King gave himself over more and more to his ease and pleasure, though he still kept a sharp eye on his revenues and was rigorous in the execution of justice. His confiscations, his French pension, his private trading ventures, particularly in wool, made him practically independent of Parliament. Alien merchants were obliged to invest their gains from imports in English commodities, and informers were encouraged by dividing among them the proceeds of fines. The severe administration of the laws, though employed as a means of swelling the revenues, was necessary after the weakness and disorder which had prevailed so long. Edward was too wise, however, to damage his popularity by systematic oppression, and to the last he was a favorite with the people of London and the other great towns. The foreign relations of his later years may be dismissed very briefly. Charles the Bold, who had proved a broken reed in 1475, perished two years later in a rash war against the Swiss; but though the Duchy was ruled by his widow Margaret, a sister of Edward, he had little further connection with Burgundy, except to negotiate a commercial treaty, providing for unrestricted trade, on payment of "ancient dues and customs." As to Louis XI he repudiated an agreement which he had made to marry the Dauphin to Edward's eldest daughter, Elizabeth, and Edward's rage at this treachery was a fatal shock to his constitution already undermined by debauchery. He was making great preparations for revenge when death put an end to his plans, 9 April, 1483.

Nominal Reign of Edward V (9 April to 25 June, 1483). — Edward left two little sons, the eldest of whom was not yet thirteen years old.

The few short weeks during which this unhappy boy Edward was nominally King were merely a scramble for supremacy between the relatives of his Queen Mother and his uncle Richard who had been intrusted with the care of the King and kingdom. Richard forcibly secured possession of his young charge, and, 4 May, 1483, was formally proclaimed Protector by the Council, while Edward was lodged in the royal apartments in the Tower. Queen Elizabeth, who had been scheming to make herself Regent, at once took sanctuary in Westminster Abbey with her daughter and her other son Richard, Duke of York.

Richard of Gloucester, His Character and Policy. — Gloucester, while pretending to secure his position as Protector, was really aiming to make himself King. Truly he had grown up in troublous times; his father had been killed before he was nine years old; he had shared his brother's brief exile, in 1470, and had fought valiantly at Barnet and Tewkesbury. Whether justly or not, he was suspected of the murder of Henry's son, of Henry himself, and of procuring the death of his own brother Clarence; yet, if these charges be true, he had acted primarily as the agent of the King in revenging enemies of the Crown. He was sober and industrious, and Edward trusted him and rewarded him liberally for his faithful service. The designs of the Queen's family stirred him to action; but, when he saw a chance to make himself King, he was unable to resist the temptation and hesitated at no fraud or bloodshed to attain his end. Doubtless, however, he intended, once he got to power, to rule as a strong just Monarch.

Richard Proclaimed King (26 June, 1483). — Bribing all the supporters he could, he set out to dispose of all persons of influence whom he could not win over. On 13 June, 1483, he appeared at the Tower with an armed force and, with pretended rage, accused the Queen and her party of working spells upon him. Three days later, he terrified the Queen into sending Richard to join his brother in the Tower. An assembly which met in place of the Parliament summoned in the name of Edward IV, offered the crown to Richard, 25 June, and, in a strange petition, exalted his princely virtues, praying that "after great clouds . . . the sun of justice and grace may shine upon us." Accepting with a show of reluctance, Richard was proclaimed King the next day and crowned, 6 July.

Richard's Crimes Undo His Attempts to Win His Subjects. — Once on the throne, Richard sought by various means to make himself popular. He went on a progress soon after his coronation, he helped the poor, he issued proclamations to suppress immorality, he ordered the judges to judge justly, and he even refused gifts from London and

other towns saying he would rather have the hearts of his subjects than their money. But he undid any possible effects of his good works by ruthless bloodshed. Several of his opponents were put to death after the barest pretense of a trial or without being tried at all, while, shortly after his coronation, Richard sent a trusted henchman, with orders to kill the two innocent little princes in the Tower, and it is probable that they were smothered while they slept. The alleged destruction of these harmless lads caused all right-thinking men to turn from Richard with loathing, while it gave others a handle to turn against him when the fitting time came. Yet he continued his vain efforts to win the hearts of his subjects, striving to do away with extortion, to reform justice, and to promote trade. In 1484 he abolished the hated benevolences of which his brother had made such use; but the necessities of military preparation forced him to counteract this measure by levying large loans. Nobody resisted him, but he could trust no one, he lived in constant disquiet and alarm, and in vain, when the hour of danger came, did he appeal to his subjects "like good and true Englishmen."

The Landing of Henry Tudor, Earl of Richmond (1485). — Meantime, Henry Tudor, the nearest male representative of the Lancastrians,[1] who had escaped to France after Tewkesbury, having secured supplies of men and money, issued a manifesto to his English supporters against the "unnatural tyrant who bore rule over them." Then he crossed the Channel, landed at Milford Haven, 7 August, 1485, and calling on all true subjects to support him as he went, marched eastward to the Severn. Richard, advancing westward from Northampton, which he had chosen as a central point whence he could march readily in any direction, met the invaders at Bosworth near Leicester. Supporters had been flocking enthusiastically to join Richmond; the forces of Richard, on the other hand, were lukewarm and suspected of treason.

The Battle of Bosworth (22 August, 1485). — While he trusted in his valor, Richard, haunted by dismal forebodings, passed a sleepless night. Yet on the morning of the fray, he addressed his captains in a fiery speech: he would triumph, he declared, "by glorious victory or suffer death for immortal fame." Henry's speech was equally stirring: he came, he said, to vindicate justice and avenge murder against a tyrant whose forces served him from fear rather than love, and who at the test would prove friends rather than adversaries. And so the event proved, for many went over to Henry's side, and more withdrew from the combat. Richard fought manfully, and sought to engage Henry himself in a hand to hand encounter. Wearing his crown

[1] See table, introd.

on his head, he cried, "I will die King of England," and deserted and surrounded by his enemies, he struggled shouting "treason! treason!" until he fell pierced by deadly wounds, while the victorious troops of the Tudor leader hailed him as Henry VII.

Reasons for the Failure of the Lancastrian and Yorkist Dynasties. — Richard's usurpation merely hastened a crisis that seemed inevitable. The situation under Henry VI had proved that England was not ready for the liberties fostered by his father and grandfather. On the other hand, the rule of Edward and Richard had shown that the country had outgrown the age when it would submit to violence and despotism. The first two Lancastrian Henrys had done much for England; they had nurtured parliamentary government, and for a time at least revived English prestige abroad. But wars, famine, pestilence, and chiefest of all, want of governance, administrative feebleness, destroyed the last of the line. The Crown and the treasury were constantly in need of money; individual life and property were never secure; robbery, riot, and factional strife kept the country in continual turmoil. The remedies sought — more power to Parliament, remodeling the Council, and reforming statutes — proved of no avail. A strong hand was necessary; that was why Henry VI was set aside, otherwise his adversaries would never have established their title, nearer in descent though they were. The Yorkists' rule, though stronger, failed to remedy the evils, to secure peace, or to inspire national confidence. The perversion of justice, robbery, violence, and factional struggles were still rife. A new man and a new policy were needed. As Henry VII united the dynastic claims of the two Houses, so he combined their policies. Observing the forms of constitutional liberty accepted by the Lancastrians, he ruled with a strong hand like the Yorkists. What the country wanted most was peace and prosperity under rulers who could keep order. The line of Henry VII gave them that. It erected a new absolutism, but an absolutism based on popularity. This new absolutism prevailed until the country had recovered from exhaustion, emancipated itself from the bonds of the Middle Ages, and was prepared to make use of the liberty which it had at an earlier time prematurely acquired. It has been said that the result of the struggle between Lancaster and York was to arrest the progress of English freedom for more than a century. At its beginning, Parliament had established freedom from arbitrary taxation, legislation, and imprisonment, and the responsibility of even the highest servants of the Crown to itself and the law. From the time of Edward IV parliamentary life was checked, suspended, or turned into a mere form. The legislative powers were usurped by the royal Council, parliamentary taxation gave

way to forced loans and benevolences, personal liberty was encroached on by a searching spy system and arbitrary imprisonment, justice was degraded by bills of attainder, by the extension of the powers of the Council, by the subservience of judges and the coercion of juries. It required a revolution in the seventeenth century to recover from the Crown what had been recognized and observed in the early part of the fifteenth.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

Ramsay; Vickers; Oman; and Stubbs all deal in more or less detail with the period covered by this chapter. *The Paston Letters*, 1422–1509 (6 vols., 1904) throw a flood of light on the public life of the fifteenth century, and the introduction by the editor, James Gairdner, is a valuable commentary. C. R. Markham in "Richard III: A Doubtful Verdict Reviewed," *English Historical Review*, VI, 250–283, 806–813, took the ground that Henry VII, rather than Richard III, was the murderer of the sons of Edward IV; but his contention was effectually answered by James Gairdner, "Did Henry VII Murder the Princes?" *English Historical Review*, VI, 444–464, 813–815. Gairdner's *Life and Reign of Richard III* (1898) is the best account of that reign.

Selections from the sources, Adams and Stephens, nos. 129–133.

CHAPTER XVIII

THE BEGINNING OF THE TUDOR ABSOLUTISM. HENRY VII (1485–1509)

The New Absolutism. — The victory of Henry Tudor brought England peace and a strong settled government which endured for over a century, while the growth of parliamentary power was checked. Revival of absolutism was due to two causes — to the personal character of the Tudor sovereigns, and to the situation of the country. The three notable rulers of this line, Henry VII, Henry VIII, and Elizabeth, were alike in many ways; possessed of unbounded courage, physical and moral, they were also keen politicians in discerning the needs and temper of the people. Usually able to get things done as they wished, when they saw that a measure was going to be resisted they drew back, but their wishes and those of their subjects were in most respects the same. So they were absolute, not because they had a standing army, or any other of the common props of despotism, but because they were popular, they were needed. Henry VII, founder of the line, though extortionate, was frugal and politic. He fostered trade and industry; he maintained peace abroad and order at home, and kept the country out of debt. Consequently he left a strong central government, a large treasure, and a people attached to the Crown. However, the revival of monarchial power was not due solely to the personal qualities of the Tudors. Much was due to conditions which had affected seriously the three political classes of the realm, the Nobles, the Clergy, and the Commons. The Nobles were no longer in a position seriously to menace the Crown. Since the introduction of the longbow, and more particularly of gunpowder, their armor had ceased to be invulnerable, while their castles were not impregnable against cannon. Moreover, the strain of the Hundred Years' War and the Wars of the Roses[1] had reduced their numbers and wealth, while, at the same time, they had discredited themselves by their turbulence, extravagance, and self-seeking. The Church,

[1] It is no longer believed that the bulk of the nobility were killed off in the Wars of the Roses.

too, was losing the assured position it had once held. It had indeed survived the attacks of Wiclif and the Lollards; but its influence had been threatened, and covetous eyes had been more than once cast on its vast wealth, and although it still retained a strong hold on the lesser folk, they counted for little, and it had to look to the Monarchy for support. The Commons, the middle classes in town and country, busy in accumulating material resources, wanted peace and protection rather than liberty.[1] As the Nobility and the Church were unable, so the Commons were unwilling to oppose the new Tudor absolutism in which they saw a friend and protector.

Henry's Problems. — Henry VII, therefore, found himself in a situation most favorable to the reëstablishment of the royal power on a secure basis. He was confronted by many problems and he dealt with them prudently and skillfully: he had to establish his title, to dispose of rival claimants, to suppress disorder, to come to terms with Scotland, to settle conditions in Ireland, and to secure England's position abroad. Each of these problems must be considered in turn.

Henry's Means of Securing His Title. — Henry's first need was to secure his title. If he based his claim solely on right of conquest, he might have to yield to any one strong enough to drive him out; furthermore, even though he was the nearest male representative of the Lancastrians, the legitimacy of title of his line of descent could be contested on various grounds. So, quite wisely, he secured from Parliament, in 1485, an Act vesting the royal inheritance in him and his heirs without stating any reasons. This done, he married, in 1486, Elizabeth, the eldest daughter of Edward IV, thus uniting the claims of the two rival Houses. His next step was to secure from the Pope, in the same year, a bull recognizing his title. Finally, he made Parliament pass an Act, in 1495, that it was no treason to obey a *de facto* king.

Royal Pretenders. Lambert Simnel (1487); Perkin Warbeck (1492–1499). — There were, however, male representatives of the Yorkist line still living, and many doubted whether the young sons of Edward IV were actually dead, and naturally the enemies of Henry VII were glad to make use of such opportunities to rise against him. In 1487 they put forward one Lambert Simnel, son of an Oxford organ maker, as the Earl of Warwick, son of the Duke of Clarence, although the real Earl [2] was a prisoner in the Tower. Crowned in

[1] In Shakespeare's *King John*, produced in the reign of Elizabeth, *Magna Carta* is not even mentioned.

[2] He was subsequently drawn into a plot, which furnished a pretext for putting him to death.

Ireland, where the sentiment was strongly Yorkist, Simnel invaded England, at the head of a body of supporters which included some of the English nobility and a force of German mercenaries sent over by Margaret of Burgundy. However, the invaders were received with scant favor, and were easily routed by Henry's troops. The Yorkist nobles were mostly killed or disappeared, and the mock king was made a turnspit in the royal kitchen, and later a royal falconer. Another pretender bothered King Henry for nearly eight years. This was Perkin Warbeck, son of a Flemish boatman, put forward as Richard, Duke of York. Receiving support in Ireland, Flanders, and Scotland, he finally landed, August, 1497, in southwest England, after two previous unsuccessful attempts at invasion. The King's army, however, was too much for him, and giving himself up, he was finally hanged, November, 1499.

Henry's Exactions. — Henry VII turned most of the plots and risings against him to his own advantage. Refraining so far as possible from shedding blood, he contented himself with the safer and more profitable method of levying fines on those implicated. Another of his many devices to fill his coffers is known as "Morton's Fork," because its invention was attributed to his Chancellor, Thomas Morton. Persons who lived in great magnificence were forced to yield large sums on the ground of their manifest wealth, while those who lived plainly were subjected to equal burdens on the ground of their supposed savings. The royal extortion increased as the years went on.

The Court of Star Chamber (1487). — Neither the Lancastrians nor the Yorkists had been able to suppress disorder, and statutes of "livery and maintenance"[1] had been directed in vain against lawless nobles and their retainers. In 1487 Henry VII devised a new expedient. Selecting certain great officers of State from the Privy Council, together with two judges, he gave them a special jurisdiction, not only over livery and maintenance, but over misconduct of sheriffs, over riots and unlawful assemblies. They constituted a court, known as the Star Chamber probably from the room where the meetings were held, which, since it sat in London and had very summary jurisdiction, was able to act more effectively than any of the existing tribunals.[2]

Poynings's Law (1494). — Ireland was a serious problem. The only place where the English possessed a shadow of authority was

[1] See above, p. 142.

[2] Later, more and more members were added till it came to be a judicial session of the whole Privy Council plus two judges. Subsequently used as an engine of oppression, political and ecclesiastical, it was suppressed in 1641.

in the Pale, and attempts to prevent the Anglo-Irish lords from identifying themselves with the natives had proven futile. Moreover, many of them were Yorkists. So, in 1494, Henry sent over Sir Edward Poynings and a body of English officials with the object of establishing and extending English rule. The new Lord Deputy secured the passage of "Poynings's Law" providing that no Parliament should meet or pass any act without the consent of the King in Council, and that all English statutes should be in force in Ireland. Although these enactments put a check on Irish legislation they had the merit of protecting the colonists against the arbitrariness of the English officials.

The Scotch and Spanish Marriage Alliances. — In accordance with his economical and peace-loving character, Henry VII preferred to avoid war and to secure his relations with other countries by treaties and marriage alliances. Two of the latter were fraught with consequences.

James IV, King of Scotland since 1488, had caused much trouble by taking up the cause of Perkin Warbeck, so Henry sought to meet danger from this quarter by marrying James to his daughter Margaret. On 7 August, 1502, the wedding took place at Edinburgh, the gayest and most splendid the poor northern capital had ever witnessed. In years to come, many wars and rumors of wars followed; but within a century a descendant of this marriage became King of England. Meantime, 15 November, 1501, Henry had married his eldest son Arthur to Catharine, daughter of Ferdinand of Aragon and Isabella of Castile, those celebrated monarchs who sent Columbus on his voyages of discovery to our western world. Arthur, however, died less than six months after his marriage, and eventually — by virtue of a papal dispensation, since it was against the law of the Church for a man to marry his deceased brother's widow — Catharine became, in 1509, the bride of Henry's second son, the future Henry VIII.

The Transition from the Medieval to the Modern World. — During the reign of the thrifty and sagacious Henry VII, England was in a period of transition from the medieval to the modern world. New tendencies were in the making, but the old had not been altogether discarded. Diverse characteristics are manifest both in the King and his age. Henry, businesslike and unheroic, absorbed in amassing treasure and avoiding war, was the direct contrast of the medieval knight, but, on the other hand, he chose Churchmen for councilors and founded religious houses with true medieval piety; he gave John Cabot a patent to search for a northwest passage, but he contributed to a papal crusade against the Turks; he negotiated free

trade treaties, but he also enacted a law against usury.[1] While English ships began to make their way to the western world, England was not yet a recognized sea power; the New Learning was being introduced from Italy, though its effects were still unforeseen; the old fighting nobility had been crushed, but the new nobility of wealth had not yet risen. In international affairs a new policy — balance of power — was just emerging, but it had not yet developed into a fixed principle.

State of the Country. Agriculture. — Agriculture was in a backward state. No improved methods had been introduced since the Peasant Revolt; the soil was exhausted, for draining and fertilizing were little practiced and artificial grass and clover were unknown; cattle could not be kept over the winter to any extent, for turnips, later used for fodder, had not yet been introduced; oxen were still used as draught animals, since they were cheaper than horses to feed and their flesh could be eaten when killed. Many things contributed to retard the progress of agriculture. Owing to the Black Death and other plagues, the supply of labor had been greatly reduced. Then the wars, foreign and civil, had further drained the population and discouraged and unsettled the surviving cultivators. Also, the monasteries, which had once taken the lead in clearing the wastes, building roads, and improving farming, had fallen off in wealth and energy. The increasing bareness of the soil, the scarcity of labor, and the growing demand for wool turned a steadily increasing number to sheep raising. Both common pastures and tenant holdings were enclosed for grazing lands, and, as sheep raising became more and more profitable, more and more farms were taken, which caused much hardship as the population began to recover again, for lands that furnished sustenance and employment to many tenants and laborers required only a few shepherds. Great outcry was made and laws were passed to check the practice, but without avail, and a chaplain of Henry VIII complained that "where hath been many houses and churches to the honour of God, now you shall find nothing but shepecotes and stables to the ruin of man." Nor did enactments to encourage the exportation of corn, to raise the price, and to prevent import until the cost was so high as to cause hardship, materially help the situation. It was not until decades later, after the laborers driven from the soil had found a new occupation in manufacturing and a new demand arose for food to supply them, that agricultural prosperity revived.

[1] In the third year of his reign he declared "usurious bargains" (*i.e.* all lending at interest) null and void, provided that the lender should be heavily fined, and further punished for his soul's good by the church authorities.

Condition of the Agricultural Laborer. — The condition of the lower classes would seem insupportable now. Their homes were mere hovels with walls of clay and reeds, with floors of mud strewn with rushes, and fires were built in a cleared space in the middle of the floor, the smoke escaping through the door or a hole in the roof after half choking the occupants. It is small wonder that even women left these "dark, cheerless, and unhealthy dwellings" to seek company and diversion in the neighboring ale-house. Tea, coffee, and wheaten bread were luxuries yet undreamed of, though meat, beer, house rent, and fuel were cheap. Foreigners were struck by the quantities of meat consumed by the English; but they saw only the tables of the gentry, the city folk, and the inns. The remote rural classes seem to have lived largely on peas, beans, and suchlike food in summer, while the salt meat and fish consumed in winter, together with bad air, lack of drainage, and stagnant water were fruitful sources of all manner of ills, such as scurvy and typhoid. The lot of the poorer classes in towns was just as bad. Infant mortality was appalling, and, what with the continuing ravages of the plague, it has been estimated that "as large a number of persons now live to seventy years as lived to forty" in the year 1500. Each little community still lived, for the most part, isolated and self-sufficing, making its own clothes and providing its own food. Roads were foul and miry during a greater part of the year, and infested by thieves, bridges were few and badly kept, and those who controlled river commerce were opposed to their increase. This lack of means of communication accounts for many of the famines, and was another cause for retarding the progress of agriculture, since no one cared to raise a surplus which could not easily be transported for sale. Yet there are some rays of light in the prevailing darkness. Even the lower classes were better off than they had been in the previous century and better off than their neighbors in France. The monks were easy landlords who seldom pressed for their rent from poor tenants and sometimes even remitted it in the hard seasons, and a number of the lay landlords seem to have followed the monastic example. The small farmers or yeomen were reasonably prosperous. Moreover, there was a chance for peasants to rise from their lowly station not only through the Church but by other avenues as well. Still the laborer's lot was, on the whole, a hard one; he might have a piece of ground to till and a share in a common pasture, but, what with irregular work, poor food, unhealthy homes, wars, riot, famine, and pestilence he was ever so much worse off than he would be to-day.

The Nobles. — The nobility lived in rude magnificence with huge bands of household men: the Earl of Warwick, for example, had six hundred liveried servants in his train; the flesh of six entire oxen was sometimes consumed at a single meal, while visitors, always welcome, often carried off meat from the table. When a nobleman passed through a parish, bells were rung, caps were doffed in reverences, indeed, even in great towns burghers and journeymen flocked to see them as they stalked or rode along the streets. Yet most of them had been living from hand to mouth for a long time on the produce of their estates and their plunder from war. Since their silks, satins, furs, jewels, and plate represented unproductive capital, they were often hard put to it for ready money and borrowed in all directions. When they could no longer carry their debts, their fine things were scattered and sold. The Tudors cut down their retinues and excluded them from their councilors, but the advent of peace and new conditions made their decline inevitable. Living isolated on their country estates they rarely possessed sufficient knowledge or training to participate in public business; consequently, with no wars to occupy them any longer, they devoted themselves to dress, cards, and dice, and steadily declined not only in wealth, but in character and physical vigor.

The Middle Class. — As a result of increasing industrial development the middle classes were growing steadily better off, and many a yeoman and merchant became a landed gentleman. A new aristocracy arose — of energy and skill, of material prosperity — ultimately to be a power in politics and society. Possessed of lands and fine raiment, the new men were hard to distinguish from the old whom in a measure they were supplanting. The rich merchant princes kept houses of great magnificence. There was, however, more pomp and show than real comfort. Great houses had rarely more than two or three beds, and bare benches and window seats generally did duty for chairs.

Distribution of Population and Industry. — The total population of England at the end of the fifteenth century has been estimated at 2,500,000, not much over a third of present-day London. In spite of a steady influx of laborers to the towns, London did not in all likelihood contain over 50,000 inhabitants, and there were probably not ten communities with more than 10,000. The poorest districts were in the north, though Yorkshire, as a wool-producing district, was forging ahead.

The Decline of the Gilds. The Domestic System. — England's chief industry was the raising of wool and its manufacture into cloth

— the latter still mainly in the hands of the gilds, who continued to enjoy a practical monopoly of trade and industry, though various indications show that they were on the decline. They became entangled in frequent and acute struggles with the municipal organizations where the two were not identical. They were accused by the journeymen of oppression, of extravagance in pageantry and feasting, and they stifled even healthy competition. A particular cause, however, for their downfall was the fact that their organization was too narrow and exclusive to meet the needs of the widening markets. So merchants began to send wool to farmers and villagers to be worked up into cloth. The "domestic system," as it was called, which began to be employed in the fifteenth century, had the twofold advantage of more adequately supplying the growing demand for cloth, and of opening a new field of occupation for the agricultural laborers and small farmers, suffering from the substitution of sheep raising for tillage.

Trade and Commerce. "Mercantilism." — Business, both commercial and financial, was, by the close of the reign of Henry VII, in the hands of Englishmen. While Edward I had expelled the Jews and Edward III had ruined his Lombard and Tuscan creditors, foreign trade, nevertheless, remained chiefly in the hands of Continental merchants all through the Yorkist period. Under Henry VII, however, natives largely superseded foreigners, while even aliens, who had once been welcomed to teach Continental handicrafts, were jealously excluded. The fifteenth-century sovereigns continued to regulate commerce, though with an object quite different from that of their predecessors. A new policy, while it did not originate with him, was most effectively and extensively carried out by Henry VII. The aim of Edward III had been, in general, to encourage the foreigner in the interests of the consumer at the expense of native producers and merchants. Under Richard II the policy was initiated of building up native trade and industry, of developing English shipping, and of accumulating treasure in the realm by excess of exports over imports, although this often meant higher prices to the consumer. If concessions were from time to time made to foreigners, it was only to secure some reciprocal advantage. The new policy — money is wealth, sell more than you buy to preserve a "balance of trade" and so bring treasure into the realm, develop resources at the expense of cheapness, aim at power rather than plenty — was called "mercantilism," and resembles the modern doctrine of protection.

Measures to Encourage English Shipping, and to Protect English Manufactures. — At the opening of the reign of Henry VII there

was great complaint of the decay of English shipping and the lack of employment of English mariners. In consequence, the King established bounties for large ships, he prohibited foreigners exporting wool to the Netherlands, and, in 1489, passed an Act that wines and woad from Gascony must be imported in English ships, manned by English sailors. Following a protective policy begun by Edward IV, Henry VII strove to encourage the manufacture of wool and to develop English capital by discouraging the importation of luxuries and the export of gold. Parliament was directed to set the people on "works and handicrafts" in order that "the realm might subsist of itself" and so stop the draining of "our treasure for manufacturers." And in the nineteenth year of the reign, an Act was passed prohibiting the import of silks wrought in forms that the English were beginning to manufacture. As the sixteenth century advanced, English artisans made cloth in increasing quantities so that the export of wool declined while that of cloth took its place. While efforts were thus made to encourage English shipping and manufactures, commercial treaties were made with various foreign countries. The most important of them all was concluded with the Netherlands, in 1496. By the "Great Intercourse," or *Intercursus Magnus*, the merchants of the respective countries were to have the unrestricted right of buying and selling at rates of duty which had prevailed when intercourse was freest, and, ten years later, Henry secured large concessions for the sale of English woolens in those dominions.

England and the New World. The Cabots. — An outstanding result of the discovery of America and the new ocean routes was the supremacy of the Atlantic seaboard states over the Italian cities of the Mediterranean. England, which emerged supreme over the others as a sea power, only slowly secured her position. None of the medieval explorers were Englishmen. Norsemen, Spaniards, Portuguese, all won distinction before England entered the field. The first momentous step was taken when Henry, 5 March, 1495, issued a patent to John Cabot and his sons, Venetians residing in Bristol, to sail forth in search of a northwest passage and for the discovery and annexation of heathen lands. In May, 1497, they started on their first voyage. Sailing north so far that they found "monstrous great lumps of ice swimming in the sea and continual daylight," they reached what was probably the coast of Labrador, and brought home "three islanders in skins," whom they presented to the King. They made two or three subsequent voyages, exploring the coast southward, possibly as far as Florida. Such were the beginnings of England's share in the discovery of the

north continent of America, a continent which they were afterwards to dominate.

The Literature of the Fifteenth Century and the Introduction of Printing into England. — The transitional character of the age is manifest in the literature and learning. The foreign wars, the domestic turmoil, and the absorption of the best minds in material pursuits were unfavorable to literary or scholarly productiveness. The "one great oasis" in this period so barren of literary creation is Sir Thomas Malory's *Morte d'Arthur*, finished in 1470. Relating in simple but graphic language the stirring adventures of King Arthur and his Knights of the Round Table, scholars value it as one of the earliest examples of English prose, while the stories which it preserves have been a source of delight for those who prize beautiful lessons of knightly courtesy and daring. In this period, too, the English language and literature are immeasurably indebted to William Caxton, who, by introducing the art of printing into England, in 1476, first brought books within the reach of the common man. For two centuries, already, a primitive form of printing had been in use: letters were cut on a block of wood, inked, and stamped on paper; but it was only with the invention of movable type that the real revolution began. The inventor was probably John Gutenberg (1400–1481) of Mainz. Caxton learned the art at Cologne, practiced it at Bruges, and brought it thence to his native land. Not only did he print existing English poetry of value, as well as chronicles and tales, all with careful revision, but he also rendered selected classical works into English. Building on Chaucer in his revisions and translations, he made the dialect of London the literary language of all England, and, by reducing it to print, gave it not only extent of circulation, but also permanence.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

Narrative. H. A. L. Fisher, *Political History of England*, 1485–1547 (1906), a scholarly work brilliantly written. A. D. Innes, *England under the Tudors* (1905). *Cambridge Modern History* (vol. I, 1903), a coöperative work in 14 vols. containing a number of chapters on England; extensive lists of authorities, without comments, are to be found at the end of each volume.

Legal and Constitutional. In addition to the general works already cited, Maitland, *English Law and the Renaissance* (1901), reprinted in *Essays in Anglo-American Legal History* (3 vols., 1907–1909). Henry Hallam, *English Constitutional History* (3 vols., 1855), dry and to some degree out of date, but still indispensable for the period from 1485 to 1760.

Biography. Francis Bacon, *History of the Reign of Henry VII* (1621, in Spedding and Ellis' edition of Bacon's works, vol. VI, 1861). James Gairdner, *Henry VII* (1889) and Gladys Temperley, *Henry VII* (1915) are good brief accounts.

Conditions, social, industrial, and intellectual. In addition to the works already cited: W. Denton, *Life in the Fifteenth Century* (1888); Alice S. Green, *Town Life in the Fifteenth Century* (2 vols., 1894); A. Abram, *English Life and Manners in the Middle Ages* (1913); Fisher, ch. VI, "The Dawn of the English Renaissance"; Innes, ch. IV; Vickers, *Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester*, chs. IX, X, "The Italian Renaissance in England" and "The Revolution in English Scholarship"; Creighton, "The Early Renaissance in England" in *Historical Lectures*, pp. 188–212; F. A. Gasquet, *The Eve of the Reformation in England* (1899) from the Roman Catholic standpoint; Stubbs, *Lectures on Mediaeval and Modern History*, two scholarly and brilliant lectures, XV, XVI, on "The Reign of Henry VII"; F. Seebohm, *The Oxford Reformers*, 1877.

Selections from the sources, Adams and Stephens, nos. 134–140.

CHAPTER XIX

THE FIRST YEARS OF HENRY VIII (1509–1529). THE EVE OF THE SEPARATION FROM ROME

The New Reign and the Young Henry VIII. — Henry, eighth of the name, became King, 22 April, 1509. The new reign began with the happiest prospects. Crabbed age had made way to youthful ardor and enthusiasm; for the new ruler was barely eighteen. Entering into the reward of the labors of the "Solomon of England," his sagacious and thrifty father, he soon exhausted the treasure which he inherited; but without an independent revenue, without a standing army, and without openly violating constitutional forms, he was able to work his will, to wrench the Church of England free from the jurisdiction of the Pope, and to end his days as an absolute King. However, many years were to elapse before Henry's subjects were to realize what a masterful man he was. The young Henry was described as the handsomest prince in Europe; tall and well proportioned, with a fair, ruddy complexion, he was in his youth a striking contrast to the huge, bloated figure of mature manhood. While he excelled in strength and athletic skill and was a tireless hunter, he was also, like most of his family, both accomplished and learned. Not only was he an accomplished musician and linguist, but he gave much attention to theology as well, and his *Defense of the Seven Sacraments*, published against Luther in 1521 — a work in which, perhaps, he was not unassisted — earned for English Sovereigns the title "Defender of the Faith," which they still bear. Contemporaries were loud in their praise of his beauty and talents, and in their hopefulness of what he was to achieve; yet while the heavens might "laugh," the "earth exult," and "all things be full of mirth at his coming," more and more the mailed fist was to appear from under the velvet glove. Three or four summary executions early in the reign only faintly foreshadow his later ruthlessness. Until his passions and his political ambitions called forth his strength, Henry occupied himself mainly with masks and revels, fine clothes, dancing and

music, hunting and birding, and the excitement of war and diplomacy.

Henry's Plunge into Foreign Struggles (1511–1514). — The leading Continental Sovereigns with whom Henry VIII had to cope at the beginning of the reign were all men of years and experience. He made his appearance in European politics by joining, in 1511, the Holy League, formed by Pope Julius II for the purpose of expelling the French King from Italy, where he had obtained a dangerous ascendancy. Ferdinand of Spain, the astutest of the papal allies, determined to use the high-spirited Henry for his own designs. So, when an English force was sent, in May, 1512, to coöperate with a Spanish force in an attack on Guyenne, he contributed no contingents, but, instead, profited by the diversion against the French to conquer the little kingdom of Navarre, which he had long coveted. Thus deserted, the English expedition, in spite of gallant work on the part of the fleet, accomplished nothing. Then, anxious to restore the English prestige, Henry led in person a large army across to Calais, in 1513. Proceeding with all the pomp and magnificence of a royal progress, he overcame the French forces, 16 August, at Guinegate in the "Battle of the Spurs," so called from the panic of the enemies' horsemen, and followed up his victory by the capture of two fortified towns. Meanwhile, taking advantage of Henry's absence, the Scotch King, James IV, yielded to the entreaties of Louis XII and led an army across the Border in August. Queen Catharine promptly hurried levies to the threatened district and placed the Earl of Surrey in command, who, 9 September, 1513, overcame the invaders at Flodden, where James fell, "riddled with arrows and gashed with bows and bills." Before his return, in October, 1513, Henry concluded a treaty with Ferdinand and Maximilian, Emperor of the Germans, for a joint invasion of France the following year. Discovering, however, that, all the while, they were treacherously making their own terms with their professed enemy Louis, he declared that he saw no faith in the world, and, in August, 1514, made a treaty of his own with France.

The Rise of Thomas Wolsey. — Such success as Henry's arms and diplomacy achieved at this time was due chiefly to one remarkable man, Thomas Wolsey, who was destined, for over a decade, to shape England's policy abroad, and to be the leading figure in Church and State at home. Educated for the Church, he entered the royal service in 1506, forging rapidly to the front. The work of equipping the expeditions of 1512–1513 and the negotiation of the French peace of 1514 fell to him. All sorts of offices and honors were showered

upon him. In 1514 he was made Archbishop of York, in 1515, Cardinal and Lord Chancellor, and, in 1518, Papal Legate, though these were only the most important of the many positions, ecclesiastical and secular, which he held. His income was enormous and came from manifold sources; he received, for example, revenues from France, Spain, and the Emperor, all of whom sought his favor. The "proudest prelate that ever breathed," he lived in magnificent state, with a household of five hundred men, keeping a bountiful table for rich and poor alike, and also dispensing charity at his gates. During the period of his ascendancy Henry gave him a free hand in all matters domestic and foreign; and he was so "lofty and sour" to those who withstood his will that ambassadors preferred to neglect the King rather than risk the Cardinal's resentment. Very generally feared or envied, there were few who loved him. Although he did something to reform the Church by suppressing a few of the smaller monasteries, his aim was primarily to get money for his educational foundations — Cardinal's College (later Christ Church) at Oxford, and a projected grammar school at Ipswich, his native town. Indeed, his life was quite opposite to that of a truly spiritual pastor; he was lax in visiting his dioceses, he did not preach, he rarely said mass, and he was a pluralist to an extent unusual even for those times. Yet, in spite of his faults, his great qualities were preëminent: he was thoroughly devoted to his master's interests; he was just, except where his personal enemies were concerned, and a good friend to the poor. While his abilities were vast and his industry prodigious, he devoted them to administration and particularly to diplomacy, aspiring to be arbitrator of Christendom.

The Struggle for the Imperial Crown (1519). — Louis XII was succeeded, in 1515, by Francis I. In January of the following year the veteran intriguer Ferdinand died, and the crown of Spain passed to his grandson Charles, ruler of the Netherlands and prospective heir to the Hapsburg dominions. After three years of negotiations, Wolsey succeeded, 1518, in including England, France, Spain, the Empire, and the Papacy in a treaty of universal peace, which was scarcely completed when an event occurred which set the three great Powers by the ears. On 19 January, 1519, the gay, needy, and erratic old adventurer, Emperor Maximilian, died. Francis set himself up as a candidate and showered gold upon the electors, and Henry, too, made his bid. The prize, however, went to Charles of Spain, who was elected 28 June, 1519. This youth of nineteen — at once irresolute and obstinate, and the champion of the Church — was already possessed of vast territories, including Spain, the Austrian

dominions, and the Netherlands, the heritage of a succession of notable marriages,[1] while his recent election placed him at the head of the mass of states which made up the German Empire and gave him a claim on Milan, as a fief of that Empire.

The Alliance of Henry and Wolsey with the Emperor (1520). — For over a quarter of a century Charles V and Francis I struggled for the balance of power in western Europe. At first, various reasons inclined England to support the Emperor. As ruler of the Netherlands he controlled the chief market for English wool, he was the nephew of Catharine, consort of Henry VIII, and, finally, because, as Emperor, he had a voice in swaying papal elections. Wolsey was anxious to be Pope, possibly as a means of reforming the existing Church system, but more especially to strengthen the hands of himself and his master in foreign affairs. In order to attach Henry more closely to France, Francis I met him, 7 June, 1520, in a valley not far from Calais, the celebrated Field of Cloth of Gold, where for nearly three weeks the two Monarchs and their wives held interviews, feasts, jousts, and attended solemn masses. But no substantial result followed this belated outburst of medieval splendor. Before crossing the Channel, Henry had received a visit from Charles V, and the two Sovereigns had arranged a treaty of alliance which was concluded in later interviews after the magnificent fooling at the Field of Cloth of Gold was over. When the inevitable war broke out between Francis and Charles, England was on the side of the Emperor. Wolsey's idea was to crush France, but did he not foresee that an all-powerful Emperor would be as dangerous to the balance of power as an all-powerful King of France? Moreover, when, in 1521, Leo X died, the Cardinals, contrary to promises which the Emperor had made, chose, not Wolsey, but Charles's old tutor, Adrian of Utrecht. Nevertheless, in consequence of another Imperial visit, June, 1522, Henry sent a new expedition to ravage the French coast, the only result of which was a further drain on English men and money and increased loss and suffering for the French peasantry.

The Triumph of the Emperor. English Resistance to Taxation. — Need of supply forced Henry, for the first time in eight years, to call a Parliament, which met 15 April, 1523, with Sir Thomas More as

[1] In 1477 his grandfather Maximilian, then heir to the Austrian possessions, had married Mary, daughter of Charles the Bold, from whom she inherited the Netherlands and a claim on Burgundy. Philip the Fair, son of Maximilian and Mary, married the mad Joanna of Castile, heiress to the Spanish lands of Ferdinand and Isabella and to claims on Naples and Sicily. Charles was born of the marriage of Philip and Joanna.

Speaker of the Commons, and reluctantly granted about half the subsidies which Wolsey ardently demanded. With this partial grant supplemented by a tax from the clergy, Henry and the Cardinal undertook to carry out a scheme arranged with the Emperor and the Duke of Bourbon for the dismemberment of the French kingdom of Francis. An English expedition, sent out under the Duke of Suffolk in the late summer of 1523, was unable to accomplish anything, because the Emperor, opposing Henry's plan of campaign, failed to furnish the requisite support. Moreover, on the death of Adrian VI, 14 September, Charles again played Wolsey false by throwing the weight of his influence to elect a reserved, irresolute Italian whom he thought would do his bidding. However, the new Pope, Clement VII, formed a league with Francis I, with Venice and other Italian states, to drive the Emperor, who had recently recovered Milan, out of northern Italy. When the Imperial army, defeating the French, 24 February, 1525, had taken Francis prisoner, Henry VIII, in spite of recent rebuffs, at once prepared to join Charles V in dismembering the realms of the vanquished. To supply the necessary funds, Wolsey devised the "amicable loan" of a sixth from lay and a fourth from ecclesiastical property, which was in reality a tax, for it was assessed by royal commissioners, and men were to be forced to pay. Resistance was stubborn and widespread. In Suffolk an armed revolt was only narrowly averted, while in London, where a benevolence was demanded in place of the loan, the Lord Mayor declared that it would cost him his life if he agreed to such a grant. In the face of such manifestations, Henry gave way, and Wolsey, who had only acted by his master's command, bore the brunt of the unpopularity. In August a truce was arranged with France and it was nearly twenty years before another English army crossed the Channel. Francis, having gained his freedom by agreeing to terms, which he forthwith repudiated, Clement VII formed with him, and various of the Italian states, a new Holy League; Charles's response was to send, May, 1527, an Imperial army into Italy, which seized and sacked Rome and besieged the Pope in the Castle of St. Angelo.

The Preparation for the Separation from Rome. — Such was the situation at the moment when Henry had come to the point of seeking papal aid in nullifying his marriage with Catharine. Since she was the aunt of Charles V, the timid, shifty Clement VII was in no position, even had he wished, to grant Henry's request. As a result, Henry, after futile negotiations, threw off the papal authority and made himself head of the English Church. This he was strong

enough to do because of the weakness of the nobles and clergy, and because of the support of the middle classes, whose material interests were dependent on royal favor. Moreover, many forces were working against the old ecclesiastical order: a new intellectual spirit was making its way into the country, bound to shake the bases of authoritative tradition; also, there was much in the existing Church system open to attack — its vast possessions, burdensome taxation, and extensive jurisdiction. Even though the mass of the common people were still under the authority of their priests, and had shown no open hostility to ancient beliefs and practices, nevertheless, the Lollard tradition had not wholly died out, while their social and industrial condition filled them with a real if vague discontent. So they were ready to welcome any change that promised relief.

The New Learning, or Renascence. — Already that wonderful intellectual and spiritual movement known as the "Renascence" had penetrated into England. Meaning literally "re-birth," the term is applied to the revival of classical learning which began in Italy in the fourteenth century. All through the Middle Ages clerks had studied certain Latin authors[1] simply as a means of training in language and argumentation, not for any human or literary interest; but the men of the Renascence began to study them for their own sake, and the Greek authors as well. Receiving a great impetus from the capture of Constantinople by the Turks, in 1453, which resulted in driving Greek scholars westward, chiefly to Italy, bringing their manuscripts with them and spreading their learning, there arose a new spirit, a new attitude toward life. The medieval man, at least in ideal, was mainly concerned with God and his Church and the hereafter. The prevailing principle was received authority, and the individual was absorbed into one or more great systems, outside of which his thoughts and actions had no play: his theology and philosophy were fettered by the traditions of the Schoolmen; his religious life was comprehended in the universal Church under the Pope; if a monk, he was bound by the rules of his order; if he tilled the soil, he was enchained by the feudal system; if an artisan, his industrial activity was cramped by the gild organization; and the dominant art — church building — was a collective, not an individual art. With the Renascence came a revival of interest in this life, with all its joy and beauty, for itself alone. A new ideal, fitly called "humanism," arose. The humanists shook themselves free from medieval received authority and the once accepted systems; they were impelled by a novel spirit of curiosity, by an irresistible impulse to assert their

[1] And Aristotle in Latin translations.

individualism. As time went, on this humanism, this curiosity, this individualism manifested itself in all fields in literature, in art, in science, in religion.

Its Manifestations and Achievements. — Boccaccio, Chaucer, and those who followed told tales of real men and women. Painters and sculptors arose who drew and fashioned beautiful human forms. Columbus, Cabot, and Vasco da Gama sought new trade routes to enrich the world, and discovered and explored unknown seas and unknown lands. The Prussian Copernicus overthrew the old Ptolemaic astronomy, and made it known that the earth was not the center of the universe but only a member of a vast planetary system that revolved about the sun. Finally, the New Learning furnished Martin Luther with the means by which he could put the papal claims to the test of Scripture and the practices of the primitive Church, though in Italy the attitude of the New Learning to the Church was generally contemptuous and indifferent rather than hostile; for the Italian humanists were pagans, unreligious rather than irreligious, and moreover, their hands were stayed from attacking the existing system because most of them drew their living from ecclesiastical revenues.

England and the Oxford Reformers. — As in most northern lands, English interest in the New Learning was primarily religious. Far removed from the center of things, torn by wars, and occupied mainly with material progress, Englishmen paid scanty attention to the Italian Renascence before the advent of the Tudors. Chaucer had visited Italy manifesting the result in much of his later work; a few of the fifteenth-century nobles were patrons of the new learning, chief among them Humphrey of Gloucester; also, some lesser men went to Italy and an occasional Italian came to England; but the real influence began with the Oxford Reformers, who took up the study of Greek mainly as a means of becoming more closely acquainted with the origins of the Church and the sources of the Christian faith. William Selling, who went to Italy and brought back Greek manuscripts, was the pioneer, while Greek lectures at Oxford were initiated by William Grocyn (1446–1519). An outstanding figure among the Oxford group was John Colet (1466–1519), who later became Dean of St. Paul's. Applying himself to study for the purpose of understanding the Bible better, he devoted the whole force of his fervid personality to raising the standards of scholarship and life of his time, and was unsparing in his denunciation of the worldliness and greed of the Church and clergy.

Erasmus (1465–1536). — Erasmus, who visited England for the first time in 1498–1499, was unstinted in his praises of these men.

This alert little Dutchman, rebelling from the bleak and narrow monastic training of his youth, turned into a wandering scholar, became the most learned man of his time, and labored for the reformation of society, religious, moral and intellectual. He attacked the monks and he attacked the scholastic theologians, whom he measured by the standards of the Bible and of rational thinking and learning; he fought for the abolition of glaring abuses and superstitious observances, for the limitation of papal power by general councils, and, above all, he worked for the wider diffusion of education. His *Praise of Folly*, 1511, is a famous satire in which he scored the men and tendencies of the age; yet Erasmus was no mere scolder. He wrote a stirring devotional manual and he prepared an edition of the New Testament in Greek with a Latin translation which was used as a source for later English and German renderings of the Gospel. A curious combination of boldness in speech and of timidity in action, he aimed rather at abuses in the administration of the Church than at the system, thus forging weapons for more uncompromising fighters; in other words: "He laid the egg of the Reformation and Luther hatched it."

Thomas More (1478–1535) and His Utopia. — Doubtless the most charming of the Oxford set was Thomas More, whose piety was brightened by his warm affections and his cheerful wit. The pupil of Grocyn and the friend of Colet and Erasmus, he thought of studying for the priesthood, but finally chose the law and public life, and, while he always courageously opposed absolutism, was for many years a trusted and intimate associate of his Sovereign. In many respects a lofty-minded reformer, Protestantism and extreme anti-papal measures appalled him; he became a persecutor of heretics, and finally lost his life for opposing Henry's will. More's greatest work is his *Utopia*[1] which appeared in Latin, in 1516. In the form of a satire, it exposes the evils of contemporary England with an unsparing hand, contrasting conditions with those in an ideal community, Utopia, where all goods were in common, where every one was obliged to work, and where the welfare of the community was supreme over that of the individual. A public system of education was provided for all, work being limited to six hours a day to leave time for study. Crime was punished for prevention and reformation rather than for retribution, there were to be no wars except for self-defense, and the Utopian sovereign was "removable on mere suspicion of a design to enslave his people." Toleration was provided for every form of belief and worship; there was a common public worship in which all partici-

[1] Meaning, literally, "no place."

pated, though each family was allowed to have its own private form as well — an ideal combination of religious unity and liberty of conscience, which proved impossible for a man of More's intense nature in the unsettled times which followed.

Patrons of the New Learning. Its Early Conservatism. — Chief among the patrons of the New Learning in high places was the Archbishop of Canterbury, whose house was freely open to scholars and his purse to the needy among them. Wolsey, so far as his absorbing administrative duties would permit, was interested in the movement, while Henry showed his zeal for scholarship by assembling many of the Oxford set about him, employing his intervals of leisure in reading and scholastic disputation, which latter, according to Erasmus, he conducted "with remarkable courtesy and unruffled temper." As yet, however, the New Learning was confined to a small circle. The attitude of the nobility was doubtless voiced by one of its members who declared: "By the body of God I would sooner have my son hanged than a bookworm. It is a gentleman's calling to be able to blow the horn to hunt and to hawk. He should leave learning to the clod-hoppers." Moreover, the Oxford Reformers were essentially religious, and, however vigorously they might tilt against its abuses, they were all sincerely attached to the Church, which they desired to restore to its primitive purity; nevertheless, the studies which they fostered were bound to lead to a probing of the foundations on which the old established order rested. In 1517 Martin Luther struck the first mortal blow at the dominant system by denying the papal power to remit sin for money payments. Very soon he developed his revolutionary view of justification by faith, according to which the salvation of the individual depends upon his own attitude to God and not on works prescribed by the Church, and began for the German people his remarkable translation of the Bible into their native tongue. Switzerland, too, had a reformer in the person of Zwingli. Lutheran and Zwinglian tracts were launched into England, though for a long time their effect was slight. Henry himself was the soul of orthodoxy, and, until his purposes were crossed, a stanch supporter of the Papacy.

The Origin of the "Divorce."[1] — In 1527 the question of Henry's "divorce" began to be openly discussed. Over twenty years previously when Julius II issued the dispensation authorizing the Prince's marriage with the widow of his deceased brother Arthur, some doubt was expressed as to whether the Pope was not exceeding his powers. Nevertheless, the young King married Catharine; and

[1] Although ordinarily referred to as a divorce, what was really sought was a ruling that the marriage had been invalid from the beginning.

apparently they lived happily together for some years. Although there was a rumor that Henry, some years earlier, intended to break with Catharine and marry again, apparently he did not take up the project seriously till after 1520. Of their several children, only one, the Princess Mary, survived, and the time had come when there was little hope that Catharine would bear any more. However, even yet the crisis was slow in developing.

Reasons for the "Divorce." — The triumph of the Imperial arms in Italy, in 1527, convinced France and England that they could not be too closely united. So negotiations were undertaken to marry the Princess Mary to a French prince, during which queries were raised as to his daughter's legitimacy that, according to Henry, strengthened doubts he himself had long entertained as to the validity of his marriage. Most likely it was the need for a male heir which really set the King's thoughts working in this direction. One pretext for excluding the Yorkists had been the fact of their descent through the female line, while the efforts of Matilda, daughter of Henry I, the only woman since the Conquest to claim the Crown, had desolated England with nineteen years of anarchy. It is barely possible, too, that Henry may have persuaded himself that Providence, in withholding the male heir so essential to the dynasty and the State, was pointing a warning against the sinfulness of his uncanonical marriage. Before long he fell violently in love with Anne Boleyn, a bright-eyed girl, who came to court in 1522. Just when he determined to marry her is uncertain, though it is most likely that it was after he determined to break with Catharine and that his passion for Anne rather strengthened his determination than caused it.

The Opening of the Proceedings (1527), and the Trial of Queen Catharine (1529). — At any rate, in May, 1527, Wolsey, after an understanding with the King, summoned him to appear before his legatine court to answer to a charge of living in pretended marriage with his late brother's wife. Divining from Catharine's stiff and obstinate attitude that she would most certainly lodge an appeal, the Cardinal speedily referred to the Pope for authority, thinking it better to act with papal sanction forthwith. And, realizing that his very existence was at stake, he strove with might and main to secure the divorce, though his plan was that Henry should marry, not Anne, but a daughter of Louis XII. Henry himself, without consulting Wolsey, sent an agent of his own to procure from the Holy See a nullification of his marriage and a dispensation to marry Anne. After he was granted a document which proved to be worthless he turned again to the Cardinal, and in February, 1528, they sent new agents to Rome, who in-

duced the Pope to intrust Wolsey and Cardinal Campeggio with legatine powers to try the case in England. But, fearing the Emperor and having no inclination to declare invalid the act of a predecessor, he instructed Campeggio to try to divert the King from his purpose, and, failing in that, to urge the Queen to enter a nunnery. Only as a last resort was he to allow the trial to proceed. At the same time Clement sent assurances to Charles V that nothing would be done to the detriment of Catharine and that the whole case would finally be referred to Rome. Campeggio traveled so slowly that he only arrived in England in October, 1528. A winter of negotiations and wrangling only proved that neither Henry nor Catharine would give way an inch, consequently Campeggio had to consent to a trial. The court was opened 31 May, 1529, though the King and Queen were not cited to appear till 18 June. Whatever the royal motives or State necessities may have been, Catharine's situation was pitiful, and she showed the courage of a noble and injured woman. Denying her feeling protests against the competence of the Court, the Legates continued the case without her; but, on 23 July, after a series of fruitless sessions, Campeggio, using as a pretext the custom of the Roman Curia, which did not sit during the hot Italian summer, adjourned the hearings till 1 October. By that time Clement VII had called the case to Rome, and all hope of securing his sanction was passed.

The Fall of Wolsey (1529). — Henry now saw that the only way to gain his end was to settle the matter in his own courts. Moreover, he determined to assume control of the State himself. So Wolsey, who had ruled as more than King and who had advised the futile appeal to the Pope, was sacrificed to the royal wrath and to the new royal policy. He fell amidst the rejoicings of all classes. The courtiers were jealous of the man whom the King had delighted to honor; the monks were embittered by his attacks on their establishments; while the secular clergy and the laity grudged the taxes which his public policy involved, and the trading classes were soured by his recent French alliance which threatened their trade in the Netherlands.

His Death (1530). — Early in October, 1529, the Cardinal was charged with præmunire, under the old Statutes of 1353 and 1393, on the ground that he had exercised legatine powers contrary to law, quite regardless of the fact that he had done this not only with the King's knowledge and consent, but in attempt to further the royal interests. The Great Seal was taken from him and given to Sir Thomas More, while Wolsey himself was ordered to retire to a manor belonging to Winchester, one of his various bishoprics. Offices, lands, practically everything that had once been his own were taken from him. Subse-

quently, however, the Archbishopric of York, together with a small sum of money, was restored and he was ordered to his archdiocese to get him out of the way. Early in November, 1530, doubtless because of his growing popularity, he was arrested on a charge of treasonable correspondence with the French ambassador, though he had merely sought the latter's aid in trying to get Francis I to intercede for him with Henry. On his way to London, Wolsey, much broken in health since his disgrace, was taken with his final illness, and had to stop at Leicester Abbey. "I am come to leave my bones among you," he said to the Abbot, and there he died on St. Andrew's Eve, 29 November.

With a small army and navy, mainly by his diplomatic skill, he had gained for England a leading place in the councils of Europe. It may be questioned whether the country was the gainer; for it took resources and energy which might better have been devoted to pressing problems at home; moreover, the Emperor made use of the English hostility to France to establish his own supremacy on the Continent, though, sometime before that happened, Wolsey had seen the wisdom of shifting over to the side of France, and was prevented by Henry from breaking off the Imperial alliance until it was too late. Whatever his achievements, in all that he undertook, Wolsey's devotion to Henry's interests can scarcely be questioned. "If I had served my God," he said as he lay dying, "as diligently as I have done the King, He would not have given me over in my gray hairs."

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

Narrative. Fisher; Innes; and Cambridge Modern History, II. John Lingard, *History of England* (1st ed., 1819–1830, reprint of 1902, 10 vols.), the general authority on the Reformation from the moderate Roman Catholic point of view. J. S. Brewer, *The Reign of Henry VIII* (2 vols., 1884) reprinted from his introductions to the *Letters and Papers of the Reign of Henry VIII*. Creighton, *Cardinal Wolsey* (1888), is a good brief account of this part of the reign, but overfavorable to Wolsey. G. Cavendish's *Life* (written in 1557, first published in 1815 and available in many editions), is a beautiful tribute by a faithful follower. E. L. Taunton, *Thomas Wolsey, Legate and Reformer* (1902), is an estimate mainly of Wolsey's ecclesiastical work from the Roman Catholic standpoint. A. F. Pollard, *Henry VIII* (1905), is the most recent and scholarly biography, rather favorable to Henry.

CHAPTER XX

HENRY VIII AND THE SEPARATION FROM ROME (1529–1547)

Thomas Cranmer (1489–1556) and Thomas Cromwell (1485–1540). — Although Henry appointed More Chancellor he made use of two other men as his chief councilors. Thomas Cranmer was a young Cambridge divine who gained the royal ear by his suggestion that the question of the validity of the marriage might be submitted to the learned men of the universities of Europe, and that, if they decided against it, the case might be settled in the King's own courts. To Cranmer, who was taken into the royal service and rose to be Archbishop of Canterbury, we owe the lofty and beautiful language of the Book of Common Prayer, and he had a large share in shaping the articles of faith for the Church of England, though he was too gentle a soul to fill the duties of his high office with vigor and independence, especially under a master so self-willed as Henry VIII. Thomas Cromwell, who for ten years acted as Henry's right-hand man, suggested most of the fertile expedients for increasing the royal power and swelling the royal revenue. After spending his early years as a soldier and trader in Italy and Flanders, he returned to his native land where he set up as a scrivener [1] and merchant. Wolsey, recognizing his ability, made him his secretary and chief agent, where he showed himself so devoted and capable that Henry shrewdly concluded he would be invaluable in the royal service. Cromwell advised the King to settle the divorce in his own courts by another means than that advocated by Cranmer, namely, by discarding the authority of the Pope and declaring himself supreme head of the Church of England. Rising steadily until finally he became Vicegerent in ecclesiastical affairs, Cromwell possessed remarkable qualities; he had a wide knowledge of men, extraordinary business skill, and was thoroughly unscrupulous. While he took the extreme Protestant side, he apparently had no real religious feeling; for he died professing himself a true Catholic. Indispensable as he was to the King, he maintained his position only by extreme servility

[1] A combination of lawyer and money lender.

and patience under insult, and even knocks on the pate from the royal knuckles.

The Reformation Parliament (1529–1536). — When Clement VII revoked the divorce suit to Rome, Henry appealed to English national sentiment by calling a Parliament to meet, 3 November, 1529. Combining force and management, he carried through a series of measures which, beginning with a design of forcing the Pope's hand, culminated in annihilating his authority in England. The manipulation consisted in bringing to expression sentiments against clerical privileges and exactions which, hitherto, had not been widely or openly voiced. The work of the "Reformation Parliament," extending over seven years, is most significant. Beside putting Henry in place of the Pope as head of the English Church, it increased vastly the royal powers: it decreed the dissolution of the monasteries, which not only greatly augmented the royal revenue, but provided resources to bind a large class to the royal policy; it deprived the clergy of independent powers of legislation in Convocation, and broke the power of the bishops by making them practically nominees of the Crown. Nor was Parliament as subservient as it seems at first sight. It indorsed the royal will in legislation against the Church and clergy because it suited the interest and inclination of the majority; in more than one case, however, especially those touching the pocket of the subject, it stood out against the royal dictation. The work of Henry in this Parliament was indirectly productive of results far beyond anything he may have contemplated; by breaking the spell of the ancient traditional Church he started forces of opposition, which, not content with mere separation from Rome, came to assert successfully the principle that the Reformation should be moral and religious as well as political, and that extremer forms of Protestantism than that provided in the Church established by law should receive recognition.

Parliament Storms the Outworks (1529). — In the very first session, as the result of an understanding by which the King and Cromwell agreed to help the laity against the clergy in return for parliamentary aid against the Pope, bills were passed restricting excessive fees and curtailing the secular pursuits of priests and monks. The clerical outworks were thus successfully stormed. Yet Henry continued to pose as the orthodox Defender of the Faith. Heretics were compelled to abjure, while those who refused were burned, or hanged in chains.

The Universities and Convocation. Following Cranmer's suggestion, the "King's matter" was referred to the universities. The opinions returned had little to do with the merits of the case; it required manipulation to secure a scant majority at Oxford and Cam-

bridge, while, on the Continent, decisions were determined by the influence which Henry and Francis or Charles V and the Pope were able to exert. At the meeting of Convocation, in 1531, Henry threatened the whole body of the clergy with the penalties of præmunire for having submitted to Wolsey's legatine jurisdiction, so, as the price for pardon from forfeiture and imprisonment, they were obliged to grant him £118,000 and to acknowledge him as their Supreme Head, "so far as the law of Christ allows." In 1532 Convocation was forced a step further, and, by the "submission of the clergy" agreed to make no laws without royal consent, and to submit the existing ecclesiastical laws to a committee of clergy and laity for revision. This was too much for Sir Thomas More, who resigned the Chancellorship the next day.

Anti-Papal Legislation and the "Divorce" of Catharine (1533). — On 25 January, 1533, Henry was secretly married to Anne Boleyn, and, in February, he appointed Cranmer to the Archbishopric of Canterbury — recently fallen vacant — with the aim of employing the new Primate to declare against the validity of his first marriage and for the legality of his second. This done, he strengthened his hand by various high-handed enactments. By the Act of Appeals, Parliament provided that all spiritual cases should be finally determined within the King's jurisdiction and not elsewhere, while Convocation was forced to declare that Henry's marriage with Catharine was against divine law. Thus fortified, Cranmer, in a court held in Dunstable, at which Catharine refused to appear, pronounced the final sentence which deprived her of her position as Queen, 23 April, 1533. Her rival Anne was crowned 1 June; in September a child was born, though, to the infinite disappointment of the King, it proved to be a girl. The Pope's reply to the new marriage was to draw up a bull of excommunication against the royal couple,[1] and to issue a formal decision that Catharine was Henry's lawful wife and that he should take her back. But, sometime before, Henry had declared that if the Pope launched ten thousand excommunications, he would not care a straw for them.

The Memorable Sessions of 1534. — In the year 1534 Parliament held two sessions and passed a series of Acts by which the authority of the Pope in England was completely abolished and that of the King set up in its place. During the first session, ending 30 March, an Act providing that henceforth no more annates, or first fruits, should be paid to the Pope, originally passed in 1532, was confirmed and extended, and all other payments to Rome, including Peter's Pence, were for-

[1] The excommunication was drawn up 11 July, 1533, but was not published till December, 1538. A bull of deposition drawn up in 1535 was never published.

bidden. Also, an Act of Succession settled the succession, to the throne on the heirs of Henry by Anne Boleyn; moreover, it was declared high treason to slander their marriage, "by writing, print, deed, or act" and an oath was imposed on all subjects to observe the whole contents of the Statute upon pain of misprision of treason.[1]

Prosecutions and Persecutions in 1534. — During the summer, commissioners went about administering the Oath of Succession, and many who withstood the royal will paid dearly, even with their lives. Some, however, were put to death on other grounds. The first to suffer was "the Nun of Kent," a poor hysterical servant girl, who pretended to foretell the future, and in an evil moment was led to declare against Henry's treatment of Catharine, and to prophesy his speedy death. A confession of fraud was extorted from her, a Bill of Attainder was drawn up, and 20 April, 1534, she and five companions were put to death at Tyburn. Among those who stood out against the Oath of Succession were More and Fisher, the saintly Bishop of Rochester, the latter of whom had already been fined £300 for accepting the "Nun's" revelations. Although they were willing to accept the line of succession as regulated in the Act, they refused the oath, because it repudiated the primacy of the Pope and involved an acknowledgment that the marriage of Henry and Catharine had been unlawful from the first and that the Princess Mary was illegitimate. For their refusal both were sent to the Tower. The royal commissioners for imposing the oath also busied themselves silencing preachers, both papal and Lutheran. While the King's orders were generally obeyed by the secular clergy and some of the regular, the friars resisted unanimously, and 17 June, two cartloads were driven to the Tower. The refusal of two communities of Observants[2] offered an excuse for suppressing the Order throughout England. Their houses were seized and such of their members as had not already been imprisoned were distributed among various monasteries, loaded in chains, and subjected to other harsh treatment.

Henry Supreme Head of the Church in England (1534–1535). — On 3 November, the Parliament of 1534 reassembled for its second session, during which an Act was passed declaring Henry "Supreme Head of the Church of England"; a new Treason Act imposed the death penalty on any one who called the King a "heretic, schismatic, tyrant, infidel, or usurper"; and an Act of Attainder was drawn up against More and Fisher. Henry, who formally assumed the title

[1] Complicity involving penalties less severe than those visited on the main offenders.

[2] They were the Franciscans of the stricter branch.

of Supreme Head, 15 January, 1535, was now absolute ruler over Church as well as State in his own land.

The Executions of More and Fisher (1535). — The Prior of Charterhouse, a community of London Carthusians, noted for their sanctity and self-denial, had reluctantly accepted the Oath of Succession, but, refusing a new oath tendered him after the passage of the Act of Supreme Head, was ruthlessly executed, 4 May, together with three others. More, confronted with the Act of Supreme Head, declined to accept or deny it; for, he declared, it was like a two-edged sword, "if he said it were good, he would imperil his soul, if he said contrary to the Statute, it was death to the body." Yet he professed himself a faithful subject. Although Fisher was old and broken in health the case against him was clearer. He had fought Catharine's cause valiantly in the legatine court; he would not accept the Act of Supreme Head; and to crown all, the Pope created him a cardinal. Fisher was beheaded, 22 June, declaring that he died contentedly for the honor of God and the Holy See. More, having in a final examination denounced the Act of Supreme Head as contrary to the laws of God and the Holy Church, and a violation of Magna Carta, perished 6 July. More and Fisher died martyrs to their faith, though, in Henry's opinion, they merited death because they defied his authority, thereby threatening the stability of the system he had set up and the unity of his Kingdom. The executions which sent a shock through Catholic Europe put an end to the last hope of a settlement with the Pope.

Death of Catharine (8 January, 1536). — Poor Queen Catharine, who, since her unmerited disgrace had been living in retirement, was finally released by death, 8 January, 1536. It is now believed that she died from cancer of the heart, but the event was so welcome to Henry that many have suspected that she was poisoned. "God be praised!" cried the King when he heard the news, and the next day he appeared at a ball with a white feather in his hat and clad from head to foot in festive yellow.

The Monasteries on the Eve of Their Dissolution. — Having made himself supreme head of Church as well as State, Henry's next step was to secure resources to maintain his absolutism and to guard against a return to the old order by a judicious distribution of bribes. A way was discovered in the dissolution of the monasteries, which offered the further attraction of crushing a class which contained many opponents to the royal policy. These were the real reasons for the step, suggested, no doubt, by the resourceful Cromwell, who, 21 January, 1535, received a commission as Vicar-General and Vicegerent, to hold a general ecclesiastical visitation. The King and his supporters rep-

resented to Parliament that they were proceeding against the monasteries because of the "slothful and ungodly lives" led by the inmates. This was largely a pretext, and the charges brought forward to support it were doubtless greatly exaggerated. Moreover, the manner in which the work was carried out cannot be justified. On the other hand, the condition of the monasteries was such as to lend at least a color of justice to the movement against them. Formerly they had been the pioneers in husbandry and sheep raising, they had served as inns for travelers, they had cared for the poor, and had fostered learning and education. But they no longer filled the place which they had in the past. Their agricultural methods were lax and antiquated, their promiscuous almsgiving tended to nourish poverty rather than to check it, and their scholastic and educational system was antagonistic to the New Learning. For some time their numbers had been steadily falling off, while, as their influence declined, the merchant and agricultural classes began more and more to hunger after their vast wealth,[1] and they had been subjected to intermittent attacks culminating in Wolsey's suppression of some of the smaller monasteries.

Cromwell's Monastic Visitors (1535–1536). — In July, 1535, visitors appointed by Cromwell began their rounds. Armed with articles of inquiry, they hurried from house to house asking all sorts of questions about revenues and debts, about relics, pilgrimages, superstitions, and immoralities. They were a greedy and unscrupulous set, chiefly bent on securing information that would suit their purpose. The reports or "comperts" which they sent to the Vicegerent seem to have been based upon the scantiest as well as the most partial investigation, for they moved with furious haste to prevent the monks from disposing of their plate and jewels. Besides the articles of inquiry they carried with them a series of injunctions which they were authorized to impose upon the monasteries which they visited. Some provided for salutary reforms, while others were obviously designed to destroy the communities against which they should be enforced: monks were not only to accept, but to teach royal supremacy and repudiation of papal claims, and they were ordered to spy on and report their disobedient superiors, thus subverting all discipline.

The Act Suppressing the Smaller Monasteries (1536). — When Parliament met, 4 February, 1536, popular feeling in the City was inflamed by means of sermons, caricatures, and pamphlets, while Cran-

[1] The extent of the monastic wealth was doubtless exaggerated. According to some accounts it amounted to at least a quarter of that of the realm, but more sober and reliable estimates put it at about one tenth.

mer proclaimed at Paul's Cross that the destruction of the monasteries would relieve the people of a great burden of taxation. After the reports of the enormities had been read in Parliament an Act was carried suppressing all monastic houses with an income under £200 a year or with less than twelve inmates. Henry is said to have pressed the measure by summoning the Commons and announcing that he would have its passage or some of their heads. Not a few of the monasteries bore a good repute, yet all too many sorely needed reform; moreover, there were good economic reasons for suppressing or consolidating the smaller and poorer communities, but it seems very strange to have drawn the line between virtue and vice at £200 a year or at groups of twelve. All together, nearly four hundred monasteries were dissolved, some of their inmates going into larger houses, or receiving scanty pensions.

Execution of Anne Boleyn (1536). — On 14 April, 1536, the Reformation Parliament, after nearly seven years of epoch-making legislation, was dissolved. Within a month that "principal nurse of all heresies," Anne Boleyn, about which so many of its measures centered, had ceased to live. Monstrous charges of infidelity were brought against her, which, because of her growing unpopularity and her failure to bring forth a male heir, Henry was all too ready to believe. After condemnation by a body of peers summoned by the King, her marriage was dissolved by an ecclesiastical court presided over by the Archbishop of Canterbury. She was beheaded 19 May, and on the 30th of the same month Henry married Jane Seymour. A week later a new Parliament, packed in the King's interest, met, declared Anne's daughter illegitimate, and settled the succession upon Henry's issue by his new marriage.

Need for a Doctrinal Settlement. — Religious belief was in a state of ferment. An extreme Protestant wing was forming, favored by leaders like Cranmer and Bishop Latimer, the greatest preacher of his day. Extremists were giving vent to the most extravagant views. One said that goods should be in common, another that priests and churches were unnecessary, another that the singing the service was but, "roaring, howling, whining, juggling," while still another declared that it was of no more use to pray to the saints than to hurl a stone against the wind. On the other hand, the Catholics were raising their heads once more. In June a book against the King, entitled *Liber de Unitate Ecclesiae*, arrived in England, written by Reginald Pole — a grandson of the Yorkist Duke of Clarence — who from his retreat in Italy was busy striving to unite the Catholic powers against his former Sovereign.

The Ten Articles "for Establishing Christian Quietness" (1536). — Convocation met 9 June, 1536, where, with a view to establishing order, Henry caused a body of articles to be introduced, adopted, and imposed on the whole country. Five dealt with matters of faith, which, it was stated, were ordained of God, and hence necessary to salvation; five dealt with matters instituted by the Church, which were to be observed, though not essential to salvation. In the first group were all the things contained in the Bible and the Three Creeds [1]; together with three of the seven sacraments: baptism, penance, and the Holy Eucharist.[2] Luther's doctrine of justification by faith was also included in this first group. Passing to the second group, prayers to saints were permitted, though they were not to receive the honor due to God; prayers for departed souls were also retained as a good and charitable custom, though the claim of the Church of Rome to deliver souls from purgatory was rejected. As a supplement to the articles, royal injunctions were issued which suppressed pilgrimages, curtailed the excessive number of holy days, and forbade the worship of images and relics. Many of the latter were destroyed, partly to weaken the hold of the ancient Church over superstitious minds, and partly to swell the Crown revenues. However, Henry still aimed to preserve the Catholic faith, merely purged of what he regarded as glaring immoralities.[3]

The Pilgrimage of Grace and Its Causes (1536). — The recent changes produced a serious revolt in the North Country. There the people, much under the influence of the priests and nobles, clung to the old forms, and their natural hostility to innovations was fanned into flame by the dispossessed monks, who wandered about pouring complaints into their willing ears. The primary cause of the "Pilgrimage of Grace" was religious, but political and social factors contributed to make the rising a complex and general manifestation of discontent. All classes had grievances. The nobles were jealous of the preference given to "base born councilors" like Cromwell. The country gentry were especially aggrieved at the dispossession of the monks, to whom they were indebted for jovial hospitality and for the education of their

[1] The three fundamental creeds of the Christian Church were the Apostles', the Nicene, and the Athanasian.

[2] A sacrament was defined as an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace. The seven which the Roman Catholic Church had adopted were: baptism, confirmation, the eucharist, penance, ordination, marriage, and extreme unction.

[3] Yet it should be borne in mind that certain superstitions, such as worship of images and pilgrimages to shrines, had long been discontinued by many devout and orthodox men.

children.[1] Many, too, were put to much inconvenience and expense by a recent enactment which removed to Westminster certain cases which had been formerly tried in the Northern courts. The sparks which kindled the flame were three commissions sent out to collect a subsidy, to supervise the dissolution of the monasteries, and to inquire into the character and competence of the parish clergy. All sorts of rumors were afloat; for example, that Cromwell, who was planning an excellent system of parish registers, was to impose a tax on baptisms, weddings, and funerals.

The Risings in Lincolnshire and the Northern Counties. — The first outbreak occurred at Louth in Lincolnshire, 1 October, 1536. Thence the revolt spread rapidly, many being forced to join by threats of hanging, though there was astonishingly little violence. In a petition to the King the insurgents demanded that: religious houses be restored; the subsidy be remitted; the Statute of Uses be repealed; and villein blood be removed from the Council. Within a week 40,000 men had flocked to Lincoln, where they received a reply from the King, scornfully repudiating their demands; and shire levies together with a royal army soon dispersed the ill-organized rebel forces. Meanwhile, under one Robert Aske, the rising spread through Yorkshire, Cumberland, and Westmoreland, drawing most of the great Northern families in its toils. The Duke of Norfolk, sent against the rebels, finding himself outnumbered four to one, promised a pardon for all and a free Parliament if they would disband. However, Henry found a pretext for a bloody reprisal in the unauthorized outbreak of certain rash spirits. Aske and the other leaders, in spite of their efforts in subduing the new rising, were convicted of treason. Aske was hanged in chains at York, and many more were hanged or beheaded.

The Dissolution of the Larger Monasteries (1536–1539). — A number of abbots in the disturbed districts were attainted of treason, and their houses were suppressed. The remaining larger monasteries, not involved in the rebellion and which the Act of 1536 had spared, Henry proceeded to dispose of by exacting what was pleasantly called "voluntary surrenders." Those heads who consented to yield were promised pensions and other rewards, while such benefits were withheld from those who proved "willful and obstinate." Thus, chiefly during

[1] Another grievance which the gentry felt with particular keenness was the Statute of Uses, just passed. In those days the law did not permit the devising of lands by will, and it had been the custom to evade this restriction by leaving them to the use of another. The Statute of 1536 — aimed against this practice — worked a great hardship to the landowner, for it prevented him from providing for his younger sons or from raising money by mortgages hitherto secured by the use of their lands.

the years 1538 and 1539, some hundred and fifty monasteries and fifty convents of women were surrendered into the royal hands. Also, the various orders of friars, who had thus far escaped the fate of the Observants, were now suppressed. Parliament, in 1539, dealt the final blow by passing an Act vesting in Henry and his heirs all the monasteries which had already surrendered or should surrender for the future — victims mainly to the royal rapacity and the irresistible assertion of supremacy, though the pretext that their inmates led "slothful and ungodly lives" was still insisted on.

The War on Ecclesiastical Frauds and Shrines. — In order to make the proceedings acceptable to the people that did not share in the spoils, efforts were made to reach out and expose frauds and deceptions. A famous opportunity was found in the "Rood of Grace" at Boxley in Kent — a figure on a cross which had amazed and edified thousands by moving its eyes and lips. It was discovered that the miraculous effects were produced by concealed wires, whereupon, although its use had apparently been discontinued for some time, the rood was taken up to London and exhibited to the populace. During this same year, 1538, the papal world was shocked in proportion to the swelling of the royal coffers by the spoliation of the shrine of St. Thomas Becket at Canterbury, whence wagonloads of gold, silver, and precious stones and richly embroidered vestments were carried off, while the bones and relics of the Saint were contemptuously burned.

Results of the Dissolution of the Monasteries. — It has been estimated that at least 8000 monks and friars were dispossessed, while about ten times that number of dependents were affected. Of their property the King retained not more than a third. From the balance a very small proportion was given in pensions to the dispossessed monks; some was devoted to the erection of new bishoprics, and some was applied to coast defenses. The greater part, however, was given or sold to certain favored nobles and gentry, whereby some of the best known of the present English families started on their upward road. The purpose and effect of the King's seeming generosity was to insure the permanence of the separation from Rome; for men gorged with Church plunder would never return to the fold. Another result of the dissolution was to weaken the spiritual power of the House of Lords, since the bishops were no longer reënforced by abbots and priors. Finally, the economic and social situation was profoundly affected, since a further impulse to enclosures was given, and the State was forced to devote immediate attention to education and poor relief. Although the monasteries had outlived their usefulness and had ceased to make the best use of their resources, the method employed

by Henry and his agents to suppress them was marked by great cruelty and injustice and caused much innocent suffering.

The Translation of the Bible, and the King's Primer. — In spite of Henry's attachment to old forms, something was done with his sanction toward putting the Bible and portions of the service into English. The version of the Scriptures due to Wiclif was not reprinted, for it was antiquated in language, it savored of Lollardy, and it was based on the Vulgate. William Tyndale of Cambridge was the first to take up the work anew. He began with the New Testament, basing his translation on the Greek text of Erasmus. Obliged, owing to his extreme Protestant views, to leave the country, he finally brought his translation to Worms, in 1525; whence copies were secretly introduced into England; but while at work, in the Netherlands, on the Old Testament, Tyndale was seized and burned as a heretic. After one or two attempts to produce a satisfactory edition, the so-called Great Bible, based on a revision of so much of Tyndale's translation as had already appeared, was published about 1538, and remained the standard work for some years. From the fact that Cranmer wrote the prefaces to some of the editions, it frequently bears his name. The placing of the Bible before the people in their own tongue had a profound effect: it opened to them a wonderful literature expressed in language of unequaled beauty and strength, and first enabled them to compare the religion founded by Christ and his Apostles with that of their own day. The English Book of Common Prayer dates from the next reign, though portions of the service were translated into English in the time of Henry VIII, notably a manual of devotion known as the *King's Primer*, printed in 1545.

The Six Articles (1539). — Nevertheless, not only was Henry too orthodox and conservative to permit any decided departures toward Protestantism, but the extravagance of the extremists served to strengthen his antipathy to innovation. This explains the passage, in 1539, of an Act for "abolishing diversity of opinion in certain articles concerning Christian religion," commonly known as "The Six Articles," or "The Whip with Six Strings," which affirmed, among other things, that: after consecration of the elements in the Holy Eucharist, the bread and wine disappeared and the body and blood of Christ entered in their place; communion in both kinds was not essential to salvation; by the law of God priests could not marry; and monastic vows must be observed. The penalty for denying the first article, *i.e.* the doctrine of transubstantiation, was death by burning, with forfeiture of goods. In the case of the others, the penalty

for the first offense was forfeiture and imprisonment, for the second offense, death as a felon.

The Fall of Cromwell (1540). — In October, 1537, a male heir, the future Edward VI, had been born to Henry, while Jane Seymour's death, a few weeks later, left the King free to marry a new wife. His position at this time was menaced by plots from within and invasion from without. First, he sought to avert the latter danger, which came from a combination of Francis I and the Emperor Charles V, by negotiating with each Power in turn for a matrimonial alliance; but his failure in each case induced him to listen to Cromwell, who advocated a Protestant marriage and a league with the Protestant princes. The bride selected was Anne, daughter of the Duke of Cleves, and Holbein, dispatched to paint her portrait, at a hint from Cromwell, it is said, produced most flattering results. Moreover, the Vicegerent and the courtiers sent to arrange the match were lavish in praising her charms. Unhappily for all concerned, Henry committed himself on these representations and the marriage treaty was signed, 6 October, 1539. Directly he beheld her — a plain, ungainly creature — "he became very sorrowful and amazed," and turned away "very sad and pensive." Yet he saw nothing for it except to go on with the marriage, and to make matters worse, nothing came of the projected alliance. Cromwell, who had already served his turn, paid the penalty with his head. He was arrested 10 June, 1540, and a Bill of Attainder was framed against him, charging him with favoring Protestants, obtaining money by bribery and extortion, and usurping royal powers. No doubt all this was true; but, as in the case of Wolsey, his main fault was that, by miscarriage of his policy, he had incurred the royal displeasure. He was executed 28 July.

Henry's Designs on Scotland. — In June, 1542, Francis I, ambitious to recover the French ascendancy in Italy, declared war on the Emperor, and Henry seized the opportunity which he had long coveted, to undertake to extend his sway over Scotland. The death of James IV at Flodden, in 1513, had left the country a prey to another of those long minorities which had been its bane for a century. In 1528, however, James V, at the age of sixteen, made himself master of the distracted Kingdom and sought to restore peace; to that end he put down the Highland chiefs and the Lowland earls, and, as a counterpoise to these turbulent elements, sought alliance with the Church and strengthened the clergy with increased powers and privileges. This and the fact that he clung to the French alliance, marrying two French wives in succession, kept him at swords points

with his uncle, Henry VIII, to whom he attributed designs of fostering disorders along the Border and broils among the nobility. Fearing to be kidnaped, he twice refused Henry's proposal to meet for a conference, he harbored refugees from the Pilgrimage of Grace, and intrigued both with Charles V and Francis I. Such was the situation when, in October, 1542, Henry sent an invasion into Scotland, which after some harrying and burning returned home. The Scotch King retaliated by throwing a force across the Western border. Through the bungling of its leaders it was defeated at Solway Moss, 24 November, 1542, with a heavy loss, and James V, heartbroken at the news, died less than a month afterwards, leaving, as his heir, a week old baby, later known as Mary, Queen of Scots. Henry now asserted the English sovereignty over Scotland in stronger terms than ever, and proposed to bind the two countries by marrying Edward and Mary when they came of age. A treaty was arranged; but, ere long, the party attached to France secured the little Princess, crowned her Queen, and assembled a Parliament which annulled the marriage treaty.

War with France (1543–1546). — To forestall aid from across the Channel to this Catholic party, Henry concluded a treaty with Charles V, plunged into war with France, and, in July, 1544, crossed over to Calais with the design of joining forces with the Emperor for a march on Paris. Since, however, the two rulers could not work in harmony, Charles, contrary to agreement, concluded a separate peace with Francis. Freed from their enemy in the rear, the French sent a fleet to attack the English coast, but twice repulsed and much thinned by plague it was obliged to turn back, August, 1545. Hertford [1] averted the danger from the Border by leading two destructive but inconclusive expeditions into Scotland. At length, in June, 1546, Henry and Francis made peace, in which Scotland was not included.

Relations with Ireland. — Henry's Irish policy proved in the long run to be no more successful. The petty chiefs outside the Pale fought constantly among themselves, but were united in their hostility to English rule. Since it would have been well-nigh impossible to conquer and hold down such wild folk in a country of impenetrable forests and trackless bogs, Henry, who had few troops, preferred a drifting policy of "politic drifts and amiable persuasion." However, the Earl of Kildare — head of the powerful Fitzgerald family — who became Lord Deputy in 1513, used his power chiefly to fight his personal enemies, and grew so shaky in his loyalty that, in 1534, he

[1] Edward Seymour, Earl of Hertford, brother of Henry's third wife.

was seized, taken to England, and thrown in the Tower. On a rumor of his death, his son broke out in revolt. After hard fighting he was reduced to submission, and, in 1534, was hanged, together with five uncles, leaving only a small child to represent the line. Then Henry attempted to resume his policy of conciliation; in 1541 he substituted the title of King for that of Lord of Ireland; and, one by one, the chiefs agreed to acknowledge his supremacy in Church and State, to hold their lands of him for an annual rent, to renounce all illegal exactions, and to serve in his army. Yet the fair hopes of peace proved delusive. Though the new rebellion did not come in Henry's time he was in no small degree to blame. His fatal mistake was that he thought in conciliating the chiefs to bind the clans, whereas he really antagonized the latter bodies by enriching their leaders with lands claimed by the tribes as a whole. So, in his religious arrangements, he might bribe the chiefs to abjure the Pope and consent to dissolution of the monasteries by handing them a share of the spoils; but the lesser folk who saw the shrines and relics demolished, the pilgrimages suppressed, the sacred buildings defaced, and the familiar Latin replaced by the alien English service were bound to nourish sullen resentment. Thus Henry ruthlessly trampled upon the superstitions and sentiments of Irishmen. Moreover, the leaders of the Anglican Church in Ireland aimed rather at establishing English ascendancy and accumulating wealth and power than at advancing the cause of religion.

Henry's Closing Years. — After the passing of Cromwell Henry acted as his own chief Minister. In spite of increasing bulk, and of an ulcer on his leg causing intense pain, he was constantly occupied and watchful. While he insisted that the doctrine and Church system which he defined and organized should be strictly obeyed, the penalties attached to the Six Articles served mainly as a ferocious warning and were only fitfully enforced, largely owing to the moderating influence of Cranmer and of Henry's sixth wife,[1] Catharine Parr, whom he married in 1543. The religious unrest was so great as to draw from Henry at his last appearance in Parliament, December, 1545, an eloquent and characteristic reproof: "I am very sorry to know and hear how irreverently that precious jewel, the word of God, is disputed and rhymed, sung and jangled in every alehouse and tavern. . . . Of this I am sure, that charity was never so faint among you, and God himself among Christians was never less rever-

[1] In 1540 the compliant Convocation had annulled the marriage with Anne on the pretext that she had been precontracted to another. Catharine Howard, whom Henry next married, was executed, in 1542, on charges of grave misconduct.

enced, honored, and served." Protestantism was spreading and Cranmer and the Queen favored it; yet the old faith was gaining ground again. The King had "destroyed the Pope, but not Popery."

Henry's Stormy and Wrathful Exit (1547).—At the close of Henry's life, the heir of the greatest conservative family in England brought the progress of the Catholic party to an abrupt check. On 12 December, 1546, the Duke of Norfolk, and his son the Earl of Surrey, were rudely thrown into the Tower. Surrey was a gifted poet, but he was headstrong, aspiring, and indiscreet. On the discovery that he had quartered the royal arms with his own on an escutcheon in his private chamber, and had boasted that his father would one day be Regent, he was tried before a special commission, and was beheaded, 19 January, 1547. A Bill of Attainder was passed against Norfolk, who confessed to concealing his son's acts, and received the royal assent, but before it could be carried out Henry was dead. He had of late become so unwieldy that he could neither walk nor stand, and, 28 January, 1547, he passed away, masterful against opposition to the last. A selfish, ruthless despot, he had accomplished a momentous work. He had transformed the whole ecclesiastical system without a civil war, he had established a National Church free from the dominion of the Pope; he had given his subjects the Scriptures in their native tongue; he had secured for England a recognized position among foreign Powers; he worked his will unopposed; and he died in his bed stanchly supported by the majority of his subjects.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

Narrative. Fisher; Innes; *Cambridge Modern History*, II; Lingard; and Pollard, *Henry VIII*. J. A. Froude, *History of England from the Death of Wolsey to the Defeat of the Spanish Armada* (12 vols., 1870–1872) is the most complete work on the period and a masterpiece of style, but strongly biased, especially in favor of Henry VIII.

Biography. P. Friedmann, *Anne Boleyne* (2 vols., 1884). R. B. Merriman, *Life and Letters of Thomas Cromwell* (2 vols., 1902) is the standard biography. W. Roper, *Biography of Sir Thomas More* (first printed in 1626, many later editions) is a classic; Roper was More's son-in-law. A. F. Pollard, *Life of Cranmer* (1904) is perhaps the most scholarly life of the Archbishop. A. D. Innes, *Ten Tudor Statesmen* (1906) and M. A. S. Hume, *The Wives of Henry VIII* (1905) are both useful. Dom Bede Camm, *Lives of the English Martyrs* (1904) is from the Romanist standpoint.

Ecclesiastical. F. A. Gasquet, *Henry VIII and the English Monasteries* (1902), the most exhaustive work on the subject, manifestly sympathetic with the monasteries. James Gairdner, *History of the Church of England*

(1904) is a brief treatment by an acknowledged authority on the period. R. W. Dixon, *History of the Church of England* (6 vols., 1878–1902) covers the period 1529–1570, thorough and scholarly — from the High Church standpoint. B. F. Westcott, *History of the English Bible* (1868).

Selections from the sources. Adams and Stephens, nos. 141–158, for the whole reign.

Results of dissolution of monasteries
Monasteries important.

CHAPTER XXI

THE HENRICIAN REGÍME (1509–1547)

Distinctive Features of Henry's Absolutism. — While Henry owed much to his father, he succeeded in carrying royal absolutism far beyond the point which it had reached at his succession. The Church was reduced by his measures to a mere creature of the Crown. The old nobility were pushed further along the road to ruin by the extravagance of Henry's Court, while his hostile watchfulness prevented their leaders from recovering their old position in public affairs. Several who aspired to raise their heads were ruthlessly put to death. Almost invariably he chose new men to sit in his councils and carry out his policy; to them he gave offices, revenues, and lands; and he had an eye for picking competent Ministers from the ranks of obscurity. Wolsey and Cromwell are merely the best known of many. By such agents, by the spoils of the monasteries, by checking glaring abuses, and by the maintenance of stable government, the middle class, already closely attached to the father, were bound still more closely to the son.

Henry's Management of Parliament. — Henry's adroit manipulation of Parliament was another means by which he strengthened his absolutism. During the first part of the reign, before he had exhausted the inherited royal treasure and before he embarked on his peculiar policy, he followed Wolsey's advice and rarely called a Parliament; from 1529, however, he made use of frequent Parliaments to give a color of popular sanction to his measures. While there are evidences of coercion and corruption, of interference with elections, bribery, creation of new boroughs, and pressure on members, the amount has been exaggerated, and it was mainly employed by Cromwell to maintain his own ascendancy. Such methods were scarcely necessary in the royal behalf; for the representation was mainly in the hands of the landed gentry and the prosperous commercial classes, whose interests in general were identical with Henry's, though on the rare occasions when these interests clashed, Parliament

did not hesitate to resist stoutly. Henry professed to be a champion of parliamentary privilege, but he employed blandishments, bargaining, or even trickery as need arose; when important measures were being discussed he generally visited both Houses in person, and, if the terror of his presence was not enough, even resorted to dire threats to secure their passage. As a means of blocking legislation which he opposed he could always resort to the veto, though, as a matter of fact, most of the legislation was initiated by Henry or his Ministers.

Summary of Henry's Methods. — Altogether Henry's power was acquired, not so much by juggling with the representation [1] as by the identity of interest between him and the dominant classes, by his force of will, and by his dextrous politics. He had the tact and foresight to draw back when he saw that he was going too far. Moreover, he had the unscrupulous cunning to intrust great powers to his principal agents, and to make them the scapegoats for his unpopular policies. Finally, he had the wisdom not to demand excessive taxes. He called upon Parliament primarily to sanction grants which he had extorted from some other quarters; forced loans, for instance, which were remitted by Statute, in 1529 and 1543, forfeitures, papal fees, and the spoils from monasteries and shrines. He borrowed and extorted so long as he could, and only applied to Parliament when it was absolutely necessary.

The Royal Extravagance. — Henry dissipated his father's savings with lavish hand. Much went for costly raiment; more was consumed in revels, feasts, tournaments, and other ornate displays. When he took the field, in 1513, he had an enormous train of hundreds of wagons and thousands of horses to carry his tents, his wardrobe, his cooks, his confectioners, and, most amazing of all, the choir of his chapel royal, consisting of 115 chaplains and singers. The splendors of the later meeting at the Field of Cloth of Gold were the wonder of the age and of generations to come. The sumptuousness of Henry and his courtiers stimulated trade, furnished employment for many, and opened up many new industries; yet in the long run, the effect was injurious, since the example was ruinous to the lesser folk, and it raised the prices out of all proportion to the increase of wages — the cost of agricultural products nearly doubled from 1495 to 1533, while wages rose only 25 per cent. Moreover, the King was in constant need of money to support such extravagances, and taxes were only kept within the normal limits by loans, confiscations, and other irreg-

[1] The chief changes in the composition came from the exclusion of abbots and priors from the Lords, and granting representation to Wales, Chester, and Calais in the Commons.

ular methods. One of the most baneful means employed was the debasement of the coinage, a process which Henry began as early as 1526, and which went on until, in 1551, a silver coin contained only a seventh of the pure metal of one issued twenty-five years before. During the two previous centuries there had been several such debasements, but with less injurious effects; because of the constant drain of money to the Orient for the purchase of goods and to Rome for the payment of papal dues, causing a scarcity of specie which lowered prices and thus counteracted the upward trend due to debasement. In Henry's time trade was more evenly balanced and papal dues ceased,[1] therefore, since debased coins circulated at their face value, good coin was hoarded or exported, and prices went on soaring without a check.

The Laboring Classes in Town and Country. — While the producers, the manufacturers, and the exporters of wool and cloth were waxing fat, the condition of the mass of the small farmers and agricultural laborers was growing steadily worse. Enclosing went on increasing, and not only leaseholders but copyholders and even freeholders were evicted from their tenements. The process received a fresh impulse from the dissolution of the monasteries, which transferred great estates from the easy-going monks to the hands of keen, greedy capitalists. Multitudes were thrown out of work, the land was overrun with beggars, and disorder multiplied to a degree that taxed even the iron rule of Henry. In order to check enclosures, measures were enacted limiting the number of sheep that a single owner could hold, and ordering a return to tillage under penalty of forfeiture till the law was obeyed. But since profits from wool were tempting and since the King needed the support of the class against which the measures were framed, the legislation proved futile. Similar disturbing conditions prevailed in the towns, the rich were growing richer and the poor poorer. The restrictive policy of the gilds was only slowly breaking down and remained a great clog on trade. Labor and capital withdrew from the old towns where the system was intrenched and poured into the smaller places, which grew as their ancient rivals declined, though the competition of those displaced from agricultural pursuits and the increase of population [2] largely offset the benefits which the proletariat gained from their migration.

[1] Although money was growing steadily more plentiful, owing to the treasure brought by the Spanish from the New World, England was little affected during Henry's reign.

[2] It is estimated that the population increased from 2,500,000 to 4,000,000 during the reigns of Henry VII and Henry VIII.

Public Health and Sanitation. — The plague, which continued a frequent and destructive visitor, was not an unmixed evil; flourishing chiefly in the miserable and crowded centers, it checked the natural increase of population among the poorer classes, and thus worked in favor of a higher standard of well-being. In London various steps were taken to prevent the spread of the epidemic. Enactments were passed requiring that infected houses be marked with wisps of straw and that exposed persons carry a white rod in their hands. Gradually, rules for isolating plague-stricken houses became more rigid, searchers were appointed to give notice of the presence of the disease, and severe penalties were imposed for concealment. Measures for disposing of the refuse of shambles, against stray dogs and cats, and for cleansing filthy streets are not unheard of, though they were apparently not enforced till Elizabeth's time.

Poor Relief. — Among the most interesting measures of Henry's reign were those taken to relieve the deserving poor and to put a check on the idle and disorderly beggars. During the Middle Ages the care of the destitute was left to private persons and institutions — to voluntary alms, to hospitals[1] and gilds, and, most of all, to monasteries. This medieval system was very inadequate. The monks, in particular, gave in pursuance of the divine command to clothe the naked and to feed the hungry: since they did not inquire sharply into the needs of applicants they were often imposed upon by the unscrupulous; and, by their indiscriminate almsgiving, tended to foster poverty beyond the point where they could deal with it. Already, some time before the Reformation and the consequent destruction of ecclesiastical foundations, certain Continental municipalities had taken up the problem and devised measures of public relief. In England, too, new methods would soon have been necessary in any event. The dissolution of the monasteries made them immediately imperative. Great numbers of needy persons were suddenly thrown upon the country, and at the same time the chief means of providing for them, ineffective as it had been, was cut off. The year in which the first attack on the monasteries was opened marked the beginning of a new policy, quite at variance with that initiated by the Statute of Laborers and succeeding measures, providing that sturdy beggars should be put to work at a fixed wage and the impotent should be licensed to beg. By an Act of 1536 the dispensing of private alms was forbidden. In each parish a fund for the

[1] A hospital was originally a place for the aged and destitute as well as the sick. A few parishes had poor funds, and so had some of the towns by the fifteenth century, but these were rare exceptions.

relief of the poor was to be collected on Sundays and festival days by the churchwardens and other parish officials, and the clergy were enjoined to stir up the congregation to give freely, but no means of compulsion was provided for. Also, sturdy beggars were to be set to work, though the law did not state how. This Act, while the principles were not yet worked out in detail, foreshadows the principles of the more famous laws of Elizabeth which remained in force down to the nineteenth century — the responsibility of the parish for the relief of those unable to work and for the employment of the able-bodied.

The Navy. — Henry VII had fostered the navy, directly, to some extent, by building ships of war, and indirectly by developing the merchant marine, but it was Henry VIII who marked a real advance. Up to his reign there had been only a few ships owned by the Sovereign, which in time of peace were either used for police purposes or let out to merchants. At his death there was a royal fleet of 71 vessels; moreover he organized the navy into a standing force and placed it under a separate Government Department. A portion of the spoils of the monasteries was devoted to shipbuilding and coast defense; the southeastern shore was studded with castles provided with permanent garrisons, reënforced by local levies in time of need; the King did much, too, for making rivers navigable, and harbors safer and more accessible; he founded dockyards on the Thames, and organized the pilots into the corporation of Trinity House. Although exploration was still largely a monopoly of the Spanish and Portuguese, a few Western voyages were undertaken. Trade to the Levant flourished lustily, and tall ships carried English cloths and hides to the ports of the Mediterranean and brought back the wines, oils, carpets, and spices of the East to English markets.

Learning and Education. — Scholars of Henry's day were turning their backs on the old learning and pursuing the new, they were devising more rational systems of education to replace the worn-out medieval methods, and the King encouraged them by his enlightened zeal, by his studious pursuits, and by the training of his children. Colet's foundation, St. Paul's, was a model of what a boys' school should be; Wolsey's school at Ipswich perished with him, but before the close of the reign some fifty others were founded, including five attached to Henry's new bishoprics. Yet it was in the theory of education that the real strides of progress were taken. Erasmus left England for the last time in 1514, but his later writings must have penetrated and influenced the circle in which he had lived and worked,

particularly his *First Liberal Education for Boys* (1529) which, with its sage precepts and recommendations, marks a shining contrast to the prevailing mechanical methods in which flogging was employed as the chief incentive. Best known among the men of recognized capacity selected as tutors for the royal children was Roger Ascham. His famous treatise *The Scholemaster* was not printed till 1570, but already, in 1545, he was putting in practice the broad and liberal views therein advocated. Although this book, on account of its learning, kindly humor, appreciation of boy nature, and rational views has deservedly become an English classic, its methods involved too much pains and patience on the part of the teacher to make it acceptable at the time.

Nevertheless, while Henry's reign marks an epoch in the theory of education, and while the King deserves much credit for his encouragement of education and for the example which he himself set, he contributed little material aid in the way of money and endowment, especially in view of what he took from the monastic institutions. Their schools and those of the chantry priests [1] were inadequate and out of date, but their destruction was serious when Henry devoted a major part of their resources to rewarding his greedy supporters instead of establishing new schools. At Oxford and Cambridge, after scholasticism and its teachers had been expelled, provision was made for regular lectures on the ancient languages and the Scriptures, while, in 1540, a few Regius professorships were endowed, yet the total expenditure was small and Henry founded only one new college. Altogether, in education it was a time of great promise but scanty achievement.

Literature. — So it was in literature. Few notable works were produced, but the reign marks the transition from a bygone period to the wonderful Elizabethan Age. Breaking away from the influence of the French medieval romance, the men of Henry's day began to study the classics, both directly, and indirectly through the Renascence writers, chiefly those of Italy. Much of the writing of the period can be passed by with a mere allusion. The disordered social conditions and the break from Rome produced a mass of controversial pamphlets which, valuable as they are to the historian, hardly rank as literature. Latimer's sermons are vivid and eloquent, but he was a preacher rather than an author. Cranmer was a master of the art of expression; but his greatest achievement, the English Book of Common Prayer, was the work of the next reign. Four men only

[1] A chantry was a place where a priest was appointed to sing masses for the souls of pious contributors. Often he acted as schoolmaster in addition.

stand above their contemporaries, and herald the coming age — Roger Ascham, who did his earliest writing in Henry's reign, Sir Thomas More, the Earl of Surrey, and Sir Thomas Wyatt. More's most notable production was his *Utopia*, one of those rare books which, primarily written as a protest against existing abuses, has survived as a classic. An Elizabethan critic refers quaintly to Surrey and Wyatt as "two courtly makers, who having traveled into Italy and there tasted the sweet and stately measures of Italian poesy, greatly polished our rude and homely manner." It is unlikely that Surrey ever went to Italy, but Wyatt did. The two introduced the sonnet into English speech, and their joint production, *Songs and Sonates*, was published in 1557. Moreover, Surrey in his translation of two books of the *Æneid* marked an epoch by employing blank verse for the first time in English. So the Henrician era, if the writers were few and their product inconsiderable, was significant in literary development.

The King and the Age. — The age, like many another, has its grim and unlovely and its gracious heroic sides. Henry and his officials were self-seeking, ruthless, regardless of human life and suffering. The merchants, the wool growers, and the cloth makers, intent on gain, were content to let the King have his will and joined in the oppression of the lesser folk. Callousness to pain and lack of pity were all too general in those times; every class flocked to a cockfight, to a bear baiting, or to witness a martyr burning at the stake with equal alacrity. On the other hand, there were strong earnest men and women who were content to suffer rather than to sacrifice their faith, were it Protestant or Roman Catholic. There were those who had prophetic visions of a new era in literature, in education, in religion, in industry, and did their part in pulling down the old medieval edifice. There was much hardship and misery while the new structure was a-building; but there was sound and vigorous health in the workers who were striving for better things. In the midst of this complex age, Henry VIII stands out as the great commanding figure, embodying its most striking tendencies, good and bad.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

Constitutional. Taylor; Hallam; and Taswell-Langmead. A. F. Pollard, *Factors in Modern History* (1907) on the "New Monarchy," the 'Reformation" and the "Composition of Parliament." Stubbs, *Lectures*.

General Conditions. Traill, and the other works cited in chs. V, XIII, etc.; Froude, *History of England*, I, ch. I; Innes, ch. XI. Thomas More,

Utopia (first published in Latin, 1516, later translated and often reprinted. R. H. Tawney, *The Agrarian Problem in the Sixteenth Century* (1912). E. P. Cheney, *Social Changes in England in the Sixteenth Century* (1895). D. Hannay, *A Short History of the English Navy* (1898); H. Oppenheim, *A History of the Administration of the Royal Navy* (1897); W. L. Clowes, *The Royal Navy* (vol. I, 1897). J. W. Fortescue, *History of the British Army* (vols. I–VII, 1899–1912), the standard work on the subject.

Scotland and Ireland. P. H. Brown, *Scotland*, I, II; A. G. Richey, *Short History of the Irish People* (1887); R. Bagwell, *Ireland under the Tudors* (1885), I; J. E. Morris, *Great Britain and Ireland*, 1485–1910 (1914), besides Joyce and Turner.

Library:—
Gardner 258-28
Anti Papal Legislat

CHAPTER XXII

THE PROTESTANT EXTREMISTS IN POWER. EDWARD VI (1547–1553)

The Situation at Henry's Death. — Henry left as his successor a child not yet ten years old when the situation demanded a strong man of ripe wisdom and tried capacity. "Abroad Paul III was scheming to recover the schismatic realm; the Emperor was slowly crushing England's national allies in Germany; France was watching her opportunity . . .; and England herself was committed to hazardous designs on Scotland. At home there was religious revolution half accomplished and a social revolution in ferment; evicted tenants and ejected monks infested the land, centers of disorder and raw material for revolt; the treasury was empty, the kingdom in debt, the coinage debased. In place of the old nobility of blood stood a new peerage raised on the ruins and debauched by the spoils of the Church, and created to be docile tools in the work of revolution."

Hertford Becomes Lord Protector and Duke of Somerset. — Before his death, Henry had named sixteen executors as a Council of Regency during Edward's minority. This body was composed mainly of men of much ambition and little scruple, and under the influence of Hertford, whom they chose Governor and Protector of the Realm, they gave full rein to the policy of reform which the conservative Henry had held in check. At the same time, they did not neglect their own interests, one of their first acts being to secure for themselves a number of new peerages. Hertford the Protector, who became Duke of Somerset, was already known as a dashing and successful general. While greedy of power, he meant to serve his country well; in addition to carrying the Protestant Revolution to its extreme limits, he strove to unite England and Scotland, and labored to alleviate the wretchedness of the poor. But he was a dreamer rather than a practical ruler of men. He was unable to comprehend that the consent of the Scots was essential to any real union, and, by attempting to carry it at the point of the sword, he inflamed their already bitter opposition. In seeking to befriend the poor he excited hopes which he was unable to

satisfy, he alienated the landed interests and widened the breach between the classes. He was arrogant, impatient of advice, and, unfortunately, prejudiced his reputation for disinterestedness by his rapacity and display; he enriched himself with the spoils of the Church, and applied the fabric of consecrated edifices to build a magnificent palace.

The Protector's First Parliament (1547–1548). — The first Parliament of the new reign passed a series of measures, all important and many of them praiseworthy. The bulk of the Treason Acts since the famous 25 Edward III were done away with, and it was enacted that, henceforth, charges of treason should be preferred within thirty days after the offense and supported by two sufficient witnesses. Also the heresy laws of Henry V and the savage Six Articles were repealed. On the other hand, a bill, passed in 1545, granting to the Crown chantries and hospitals, was renewed and enforced, and the fruits of their suppression, together with the religious property of gilds, were turned over to the Council; some was appropriated by those in control, and a very inadequate portion was later applied to the founding of schools.

Protestant Excesses. — The greatest confusion, license, and profanity prevailed. Each parish became a law unto itself, and individuals likewise threw off all restraint. Some were honest zealots, others made war on the ancient order solely for gain. Foreigners poured in: Lutherans from Germany, Calvinists from Geneva, Zwinglians from Zurich, as well as "heretics of every hue," so that England was regarded by horrified orthodoxy as "the harbor of all infidelity."[1] During the summer and autumn of 1547 agents were sent out by the Council, under color of royal authority, to enforce the use of English in the services; the destruction of images, stained glass windows, paintings, and carvings; and the acknowledgment of the royal supremacy. Various ceremonies were done away with, such as the creeping to the cross on Good Friday, the use of ashes, palms, candles, and holy water, while the clergy of the old faith were checked in their preaching activities. These measures were resisted so stoutly by Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, and Bonner, Bishop of London, that they were imprisoned, and Bonner was soon deprived of his See. This was the farthest the Protector ever went in religious persecution.

The First Act of Uniformity and the Book of Common Prayer (1549). — In January, 1549, Parliament passed an Act of Uniformity which

[1] Neither Lutheranism nor Zwinglianism exercised any abiding influence, nor was the Church organization of Calvin ever generally accepted; but his theology, especially his doctrine of predestination, and his political principles came to affect Englishmen profoundly.

imposed on all subjects the form of service contained in a Book of Common Prayer drawn up by a commission headed by Cranmer. This book was an English version, somewhat simplified, of the old Latin ritual. The Act of 1549 was mild compared with the later acts; for it was limited to the clergy, it insisted only upon uniformity of outward observance, and no attempt was made to impose a doctrinal test. Princess Mary, who refused to conform, was allowed by the Protector to hear mass in her own house. Yet the new arrangement satisfied neither of the extreme parties. It still savored too much of Rome for the "hotgospellers," while the country folk, under the influence of the parish priests, resisted even the moderate changes which it introduced. However, the men of Devon and Cornwall, who arose in revolt in July, were suppressed before the end of August by a Government force assisted by mercenaries.

Kett's Rebellion (1549). — While the mainspring of the revolt in the Southwest was religious, discontent existed throughout the country, due to agrarian distress, to the steady rise of prices resulting from the debased currency, and to the repressive vagrancy laws. Somerset caused remedial measures to be framed which were rejected by Parliament. The result was a rising in the Eastern counties led by one Robert Kett. Though he set up a court before which offending landlords were summoned, he kept his forces in good order, prohibited all bloodshed, had prayers morning and evening and frequent addresses from preachers. A petition was drawn up, very moderate in tone, begging that enclosures and other oppressive practices might be diminished. "We pray," it plaintively declared, "that all bondmen be made free; for God made all free with his precious blood-shedding." The insurgents having rejected a pardon on the ground that "Kings were wont to pardon wicked persons and not innocent and just men," were finally defeated by a force under John Dudley, Earl of Warwick, made up partly of foreign mercenaries, while Kett was captured and later executed. Somerset had been obliged to employ force against the very class whose hopes he had raised, and Warwick saw the opportunity which he had long sought for overthrowing his rival. Many other things besides had contributed to discredit the Protector.

Failure of Somerset's Scotch and French Policy. — In May, 1546, a body of the anti-French, anti-Catholic nobles had murdered Cardinal Beaton and seized the castle of St. Andrew's. Somerset, failing either to make an alliance with the French King or to prevent him from sending assistance to the Government whereby the insurgents were overcome, lost a chance of building up a strong native Protestant party.

He offered to give up the English claims to sovereignty and urged a union, but he insisted that the marriage treaty of 1543 should be carried out: when the Scots refused, he crossed the border and inflicted a defeat on them at Pinkie, 10 September, 1547. The infuriated Scots forthwith proposed a marriage between the Princess Mary and the Dauphin Francis. Mary was taken to France, and the marriage, concluded in course of time, drew still closer England's two most dangerous enemies.

The Fall of Somerset (1549). — Another handle against the Protector was found in the summary execution, following a Bill of Attainder, of his brother Thomas, the Lord High Admiral, an unscrupulous man of boundless ambitions, who plotted to make himself the supreme power in the State. Although he richly deserved his fate, the Protector was blamed for thus arbitrarily disposing of his own flesh and blood. So Warwick and the other leaders of the Council, who nourished grievances or hoped for gain and power, had many charges to bring forward against the Protector: the strife engendered by his religious, social, and agrarian policy; his mismanagement of foreign affairs; his treatment of his brother; his arrogance and heedlessness of advice; and his profuseness and greed. After a vain effort, by means of inflammatory pamphlets, to rouse the lesser folk to rise in his defense, Somerset fled from London, taking the young King with him. Induced by fair promises to surrender, 10 October, he was nevertheless imprisoned in the Tower.

Warwick Supreme in the Council. His Protestant Zeal. — The control of affairs now passed into the hands of Warwick, a brilliant soldier, a cunning diplomat, utterly unscrupulous, masking religious indifference under a pretended zeal for the Protestant cause. His first step was to secure from Parliament a series of Acts making it treason to assemble for the purpose of killing or imprisoning a member of the Privy Council, or to meet with a view for breaking down enclosures. Thus strengthened he proceeded to act his part of advanced Protestant reformer with fervid zeal. Not only did he keep Norfolk, Bonner, and Gardiner in prison, but he deprived the latter of his See, and imprisoned and deprived half a dozen more of the bishops as well. With the bishoprics thus acquired he rewarded the leaders of the reform party. The destruction of the altars, images, and painted windows went on merrily, and the ecclesiastical lawlessness increased, though for the sake of balance, one Anabaptist and another extremist were burned. Warwick's adherents were as greedy of pelf as ever Somerset had been: they gorged themselves with such church plate as remained unappropriated, and with proceeds from chantry lands

reserved for the support of dispossessed priests, for the education of the youth, and the support of the poor.

The "Judicial Murder" of Somerset (1552). — From 1550 to 1552, Warwick got on without a Parliament. He packed the Council with his own followers, he made himself its president, he had himself created Duke of Northumberland, but he did not venture to assume the title of Lord Protector. His old rival was released from the Tower, 6 February, 1550, and re-admitted to the Council in April. When he naturally sought to recover his lost power he was once more arrested, 16 October, 1551, and tried by a court selected by Northumberland from his satellites, in which, after much stretching of evidence, he was finally convicted of felony for inciting an unlawful assembly. He was executed 22 January, 1552, by a royal order fraudulently obtained for the purpose. The popular indignation almost provoked a riot, while strong opposition manifested itself in Parliament, which met the following day.

The Second Act of the Uniformity (1552). — Yet, voicing the increasing Protestant sentiment, this same Parliament sanctioned a revised edition of the Book of Common Prayer, in which the priest was called a "minister" and the altar a "table." Though the Holy Communion was still to be received kneeling, it was declared that the posture meant "no adoration to any Real Presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood." A second Act of Uniformity enjoining the use of the Book thus revised also imposed penalties for non-observance upon the laity as well as the clergy. Any one neglecting to attend service on Sunday and holidays was liable to excommunication, and the penalty for attending any other form was six months' imprisonment for the first offense, a year for the second, and life for the third. Cranmer, who had been in charge of the work of revision, also drew up a series of forty-two articles defining the faith, which were sanctioned by a royal proclamation in June, 1553, without being submitted to Parliament.

Northumberland's Plot (1553). — As his arbitrariness and self-seeking became increasingly evident, the Duke lost ground steadily; even the preachers who had hailed him as a new Moses or a new Joshua, began to denounce him. Realizing that Edward's brief and sickly life was drawing to a close, he devised his last and most daring scheme, designed to secure a successor over whom he might exercise control. By promises and threats he got the Council and the judges to pass over the King's two sisters, Mary and Elizabeth, who were the next heirs, and to vest the succession in a grandniece of Henry VIII — Lady Jane Grey — whom he married to his fourth son Guilford Dudley. This was in June, 1553. On 6 July, King Edward VI died in his six-

teenth year. The matter was kept secret as long as possible, and 10 July, Lady Jane Grey was proclaimed in London.

Edward's Characteristics. His Foundations. — Edward was a frail sedate youth, devoted to his books, who, as he grew older, began to exhibit more and more his father's masterful temper and regal dignity, and had he lived would probably ere long have shaken off the ascendancy which Northumberland managed to gain over him. To precocity of intellect he united an intense religious ardor; even when a lad of fourteen he was, we are told, "exerting all his powers for the restoration of God's kingdom," and his premature death from consumption was a sudden check on the course of the Reformation. In spite of the greedy adventurers who surrounded him, he was able to do something for learning and charity. From the sale of chapels, chantries, and other Church property he endowed, or re-endowed, upwards of thirty grammar schools. Christ's Hospital, founded for the sons of the poor, formerly the Grey Friars monastery, became the famous Bluecoat School. Funds were given to two hospitals for the medical treatment of the indigent, and one palace was turned into an institution of the same sort. The royal palace of Bridewell became a workhouse or a house of correction for "ramblers, dissolute and sturdy beggars." Inadequate as all this was, it was more than Henry VIII had attempted.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

Narrative. A. F. Pollard, *History of England, from the Accession of Edward VI to the Death of Elizabeth* (1910), together with Innes, Lingard, Froude, and *Cambridge Modern History*. A. F. Pollard, *England under Protector Somerset* (1900), the standard work on the Protector, rather in the nature of an apology.

Constitutional and ecclesiastical: the works already cited.

Selections from the sources. Adams and Stephens, nos. 159–162.

CHAPTER XXIII

THE ENGLISH COUNTER-REFORMATION. MARY (1553–1558)

Defeat of the Northumberland Plot (1553). — When Mary learned of the events in London she took refuge in a fortified manor house in Suffolk. At once, loyal gentlemen and their retainers flocked to her support. On the other hand, London showed no enthusiasm for Lady Jane Grey, and the citizens, alienated by the religious excesses of the late reign and the attempt to deprive the rightful heir, preserved an ominous silence as Northumberland led forth an army against the Marian forces. When, after his departure, Lady Jane's own father proclaimed Mary as Queen, 19 July, they responded joyously by ringing bells, lighting bonfires, and shouting applause. Northumberland's troops dropped away as he marched, so, 20 July, he declared for Mary himself, protesting tearfully that he knew her to be a merciful woman. Ordered to disband his army, he was arrested and taken to London, and, 3 August, 1553, the new Queen, accompanied by a glittering escort, rode into the City. Her first act was to release Norfolk, Gardiner, and various other prisoners. Of those who had plotted against her accession seven were tried and condemned, though only three were executed; even Lady Jane Grey was only imprisoned; but Northumberland tried in vain to avert his richly deserved fate by professing himself a Catholic.

Mary's Character and Policy. First Measures of the Reign. — In spite of contemporary accounts of her beauty, portraits of Queen Mary represent her as prim and unprepossessing. Because of her unflinching loyalty to her mother and to the old religion, she had suffered much in her youth from the harshness of Henry VIII and his agents; yet she was highly educated, and not only her mental endowments but her accomplishments were uncommon, while, notwithstanding flurries of temper due to her joyless existence and constant ill-health, she was much loved by her servitors and ministers for her generosity and kindness. Her dearest wish was to restore England to the Catholic fold; for that she had embittered her life and all but lost her birthright. Almost directly upon her accession

she issued a proclamation urging all men to return to the old faith, she ordered the restoration of much of the stolen church plate, and she gave warning to "busy meddlers in religion," though the formal settlement of the religious problem was reserved to Parliament.

The System of Henry VIII Restored by Parliament (1553). — Parliament, which met 5 October, 1553, went no farther than to pass an act repealing all laws of Edward's reign affecting religion and the Church and restoring the service as it was in the last year of Henry VIII. Most of the members had no desire to reverse Henry's policy and again to accept papal rule. There was a general desire to have the Queen marry and settle the succession, though a considerable majority opposed a plan to unite her with Philip, son of the Emperor Charles V and heir to his Spanish dominions, a plan designed to counteract the Franco-Scot alliance and to restore the power of the Pope with Imperial aid. As a protest against the projected Spanish match, the Commons prepared an address praying the Queen to marry an English noble; but Mary, who had determined on Philip, rebuked them sharply. In January, 1554, the marriage articles were arranged, and upon terms most favorable to England. If the Queen should die without issue her husband was to make no claim on the succession. On the other hand, any child born of the marriage would succeed both to the English Kingdom and to Philip's inheritance in the Low Countries. Also, Philip agreed not to engage England in his father's wars with France.

Wyatt's Rebellion (1554). — Popular opposition was aroused to a pitch sufficient to give Mary's enemies a chance to plan a widespread rebellion, which, while professing to free her from her evil councilors and to prevent the Spanish marriage, really aimed, with French help, to depose the Queen and to set up Lady Jane Grey or Elizabeth in her place. But the design leaked out prematurely and a complete confession was wrung from one of the leaders. Three separate outbreaks had been planned. One in Devon and one in the Midlands were easily suppressed, but the third, starting in Kent, under Sir Thomas Wyatt,[1] a young Catholic, was serious; for he succeeded in marching his forces into the heart of London before he could be overcome. About sixty of the insurgent leaders, including Wyatt, were put to death, and Lady Jane Grey and her husband were now executed for their part in the old Northumberland plot. An effort to implicate Elizabeth failed from lack of evidence.

The Arrival of Philip and the Return to Rome (1554). — Wyatt's rebellion was followed by more rigorous measures against Protestants.

[1] He was a son of the poet, *v.* p. 228.

Foreign congregations were ordered to quit the realm, married clergy were forced to give up their wives or to leave their benefices, and altars were erected in the village churches. On 20 July Philip landed in England. Mary met him at Winchester, where, on the 25th, they were married. After a month of festivities the royal pair journeyed to London with a stately train, including twenty-eight carts filled with bullion. But Philip was unable to overcome the general aversion with which he was regarded, and his attendants were hustled and beaten in the streets. Parliament met again, 12 November, 1554, the sheriffs had been ordered to return men of "a wise, grave, and Catholic sort," and, 29 November, in answer to their petition, Cardinal Pole, who had recently arrived as papal legate, solemnly received the realm "again into the unity of our own Mother the Holy Church." This reunion, however, even with a packed Parliament, would never have come to pass but for his assurance that the Pope had consented to waive the restoration of the Church lands. Parliament then completed the revival of the old order by repealing all measures "against the See Apostolic of Rome since the twentieth year of King Henry VIII," and restoring all the heresy laws.

The Marian Persecutions (1555–1558). — Then began four horrible years of persecution which have stained indelibly the memory of the Queen and fastened upon her the name of "Bloody Mary." Up to this time comparatively lenient, the national opposition, which had manifested itself in armed rebellion, really marked the turning point in her reign. Other causes, however, contributed to change her policy. Philip, who had married her purely for reasons of State, grew colder and colder, and soon left the country, to return only once again when he wanted aid; then Mary was denied what she most desired, an heir to perpetuate her name; and, finally, her health, never robust, grew steadily worse. While these facts help to explain the cruelty of her methods, it must not be forgotten that Mary regarded it as her supreme duty to extirpate heresy and restore the purity of the faith. Moreover, the reformers were violently abusive; there was no idea of toleration in those days, for heresy was regarded as a loathsome disease to be stamped out at all costs; thousands on the Continent suffered for their faith, and disregard of human life and suffering were everywhere a feature of the age. Mary was not alone in thinking that obstinate heretics should suffer death for "the great horror of their offense and the manifest example of other Christians"; still, if her lot had been a happier one and her subjects had not risen against her, she might have softened her stern sense of duty by considerations of policy and humanity.

Parliament shares the blame for the persecutions which followed. Gardiner, the Queen's chief Minister, advised the step; but he hoped that a few examples would be sufficient, and he died less than a year after the persecutions had begun. Pole was too gentle a spirit to enter into heresy-hunting with any zeal; although Mary forced him into line, he more than once admonished the bishops to moderation. Philip, keen scenter and torturer of heretics in his own dominions, for reasons of policy took no share in the proceedings in England. Bishop Bonner has often been charged with exceptional activity and cruelty, but he seldom spoke at the examinations, while, after an accused person had been condemned, he often worked secretly to make him recant. Furthermore, the Queen frequently had to spur his lagging zeal. His reputation seems to have been due to the fact that there were more executions in his diocese than elsewhere, but it contained the bulk of the heretics; and, when he felt duty bound to proceed with energy, he was hot-tempered and treated prisoners roughly, but more likely to frighten them into recanting than because he was bloodthirsty.

The Martyrs. — Mary's victims numbered nearly 300, a total greater than that in Henry VIII's reign of thirty-eight years or Elizabeth's of forty-five. At the stake many faithful ministers of devoted flocks, and humble artisans and tillers of the soil as well, showed unflinching courage and serene imperviousness to frightful torture. In the pages of Fox's *Martyrs* their names shine brightly with those of their fellow sufferers high in social or church rank. On 16 October, 1555, Bishop Latimer, the matchless popular orator, and Bishop Ridley were burned at Oxford. At the stake he called to his weaker companion: "Be of good comfort, Master Ridley, we shall this day light such a candle by God's grace in England as, I trust, shall never be put out." He received the flame as if embracing it, crying vehemently in his own English tongue: "Father in Heaven, receive my soul." Cranmer, perplexed and fearful of suffering, signed at least six recantations before he was finally condemned. Yet his end was truly heroic. Confessing himself "a wretched caitiff and a miserable sinner," he thrust first into the flames the hand which had signed the recantation, crying: "This hand hath offended." He perished, 20 March, 1556. The effect upon the people was tremendous. The Primate of the National Church, the author of the beautiful Book of Common Prayer, had been martyred for an ecclesiastical system which an English King and an English Parliament had discarded. Plainly such examples encouraged rather than frightened the weaker. Even the most devoted Romanists

recoiled, but the stern misguided Queen persisted in the useless butchery.

War with France (1557). Loss of Calais (1558). — Everything, however, worked against her. A new Pope, Paul IV, insisted upon the restoration of the Church lands, thus alienating many of her Catholic supporters. In March, 1557, Philip, during the course of a three months' visit, succeeded in drawing the English into a war between Spain and France which had just broken out. An excuse was furnished by anti-Marian plots, supposed, in spite of his denial, to have been assisted by the French King; but the result of this violation of the marriage treaty was most humiliating and damning to Mary. On 6 January, 1558, Calais, the last English possession on French soil, was captured by the French. Three months later Mary, Queen of Scots, was married to the Dauphin. At home the English prospects were as dark and threatening as they were abroad. An ague fever raged through the land during the summer and autumn of 1557 and 1558, corn was dear, trade and agriculture languished, and heavy taxes were imposed to meet the cost of the unsuccessful and unpopular war.

Death of Queen Mary (1558). — In the midst of sullen discontent engendered by persecution, foreign and papal intermeddling, financial stress, and national humiliation, Mary, long ailing in health and broken down by a cumulation of disappointments, succumbed to the prevailing epidemic. The loss of Calais was the crowning grief. "When I am dead and opened," she said in her last illness, "you will find Calais lying upon my heart." She died 17 November, 1558. Pole, who had succeeded Cranmer as Archbishop of Canterbury, followed her to the grave within a few hours. In a prayer book, said to be hers, the pages which contain the prayers for the unity of the Holy Catholic Church are stained with tears and much handling. Her marriage to Philip was the greatest mistake of her life; it outraged national sentiment and ruined what chance there was of making her religious policy prevail, while the oppositions which it excited, and its other unhappy consequences, accentuated her austere sense of duty into blind fanaticism.

The Results of the Marian Exile. — The activity of the Marian exiles, who flooded the country with furious and inflammatory writings, made the lot of those who remained behind much harder than it might otherwise have been. At the beginning of the reign all foreign exiles had been ordered to leave the realm within twenty-four days under pain of imprisonment and loss of goods. About 800 migrated, together with 200 English disciples. During their sojourn

abroad, Calvinism took a firm hold upon the Marian exiles, an earnest and thinking class. On their return under Elizabeth they brought back and spread their views among their countrymen, with marked effect upon England's future religion and politics.

Calvinism. — Calvinism had two sides. The cornerstone of its doctrine was predestination, which came to be accepted even by many loyal members of the Church of England. Then there was its system of Church government, which substituted for the Episcopal hierarchy a series of representative assemblies. Each church had its "kirk session," consisting of the pastor or "presbyter" and a body of elders chosen by the congregation. These were grouped into "presbyteries, or classes," which, in their turn, were grouped into "synods." Finally there was the "general assembly," composed of representatives from the smaller bodies, and exercising jurisdiction over the whole. This Calvinistic system ultimately came to be the form established in Scotland. In England, where it never received any official sanction, it was adopted by an aggressive and influential class and played an important part in public affairs for over a century.

Up to the time of Calvin the principle of the Reformation had been *cujus regio, ejus religio*, meaning, the religion of the ruler shall be the religion of the land. That had been, and was to remain, the basis of settlement in Germany and in England. Calvinism, on the other hand, like Roman Catholicism, was opposed to national independence and State control. Each claimed to be a universal Church superior to all rulers. The State was regarded as the servant, not the master of the Church. Yet there was one fundamental difference between the two. The Roman organization was monarchical, while the Calvinistic was, in theory at least, republican. The pastors and elders were supposed to be the representatives, the chosen instruments of the congregation. As a matter of fact, wherever Calvinism got a foothold the presbyters sought to gain complete control in political as well as religious affairs. This is the chief reason why the mass of Englishmen ultimately rejected it; not, however, before it had accomplished a great work, in helping to make the Reformation something more than a transference of religious headship from Pope to King.

The Scotch Reformation. John Knox. — The overthrow of the Church of Rome in Scotland is unique in that it was brought about, not under the leadership of, but in opposition to, the Sovereign. After the death of James V the control of the government was gradually secured by Cardinal Beaton and the Queen Dowager, who finally became Regent, in 1554. In her effort to maintain Roman

Catholic ascendancy under a French alliance there were three elements ranged against her: the Protestants, the anti-French party, and the nobles, poor and greedy, who coveted the riches of the Church. The burning of George Wishart, 1 March, 1546, occasioned the first rising, when a body of nobles banded together and murdered in his bed, 29 May, Cardinal Beaton, the great and worldly Archbishop of St. Andrew's, author of Wishart's death. Seizing the Castle of St. Andrew's they were joined by many of the anti-Catholic, anti-French party. Among those who came was John Knox (1505–1572) who, more than any other man, was the author and organizer of the Scotch Reformation. Hard, narrow he was, but a born leader, eloquent and fearless. In July, 1547, when the castle surrendered to a combined force of French and Scots, he was taken prisoner, and served in the French galleys till February, 1549. Then he became a preacher in England, but, shortly after Mary's accession, fled to the Continent. There he met Calvin, whose views he adopted, and settled in Geneva as minister of the English congregation. In the autumn of 1555 he paid a brief visit to Scotland, during which he started an organization of the nobles that resulted, 3 December, 1557, in a bond or "covenant" to "establish the most blessed word of God." The signatories, or "Lords of the Congregation," as they were called, were actuated partly by political motives and hope of gain, but a petition, framed in 1558, shows that they demanded reform in the Church; "the right of public and private prayer in common speech, of explaining and expounding the Scriptures, and of communion in both kinds."

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

Narrative. Pollard, Innes, Lingard, Froude, and *Cambridge Modern History*. M. J. Stone, *Mary I, Queen of England* (1901); an apology for Mary.

Constitutional and ecclesiastical as above. John Fox, *Acts and Monuments*, popularly known as the *Book of Martyrs* (first published in 1563, best edition Townshend's, 8 vols., 1843–1849) although marred by inaccuracies and bias; this is the classic contemporary account of the Marian Martyrs.

Selections from the sources. Adams and Stephens, nos. 163–166.

CHAPTER XXIV

THE ELIZABETHAN RELIGIOUS SETTLEMENT AND THE EARLY YEARS OF THE REIGN (1558–1572)

Elizabeth's Accession and Character. — When Elizabeth received the news that she was Queen of England she cried: "This is the Lord's doing, and it is marvelous in our eyes." It was a great heritage and one which brought with it tremendous problems for a young woman of twenty-five. The new Queen, however, was endowed with rare qualities which had been sharpened by hard schooling in the world of men and books. Hers was a puzzling contradictory nature, though the gold glittered brightly through the dross. While vain, uncertain of temper, and unscrupulous, she united imperious dignity with prudence and tact, and was an adept in the art of concealing her meaning in well sounding words. Her physical vigor and endurance were remarkable, she could hunt all day, dance or watch masques and pageants all night, and when necessary apply herself unremittingly to business.

Her Diplomatic Courtships. — Her youth had only been less hard than that of her sister Mary. Parental, brotherly, and sisterly affection were all excluded from her life. Her first love affair was with Somerset's self-seeking brother, who aimed to use her as an instrument of his ambition, and, freeing herself only with difficulty from the charge of complicity in his plots, she ceased henceforth to trust any one. Thomas Seymour was the first of a long line of suitors, though her subsequent courtships were merely a part of the great diplomatic game which she played so successfully throughout her reign. While to gain political advantage she led men on, she was determined never to marry. This question, as well as that of the succession, she was bound that Parliament should not discuss, and members who presumed to disobey were overwhelmed with her wrath. Elizabeth was as lacking in religious sense as she was in scruple and delicacy; she had no sympathy with the advanced Protestantism of Edward's reign and still less with Mary's Roman Catholic restoration.

Elizabeth's Favorites and Councilors. — Sure that they would not influence her judgment at crises, the Queen all through life indulged

her passion for the flattery of handsome, accomplished men and kept a large following of favorites. The chief of them all was Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, son of the notorious Northumberland; his step-son, Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex, was "a pleasing and fruitless object" whom Elizabeth took up in his old age; Sir Walter Raleigh, with far greater abilities and merits than either, came to a tragic end in the next reign. For serious business Elizabeth chose good, wise Ministers. William Cecil, Lord Burghley (1520–1598), was her chief advisor for forty years; though lacking the vision and ideals of the highest type of statesmanship, he was cautious, sane, methodical, and amazingly industrious. Francis Walsingham (1530–1590), who served as Secretary of State from 1573 till his death, was a zealous Protestant, unrivaled for his skill in unraveling plots against the throne, and excellently versed in foreign affairs. In spite of their capacity and devotion Elizabeth was often at odds with her Ministers, largely because of their excessive Protestant zeal. Her outlook was doubtless broader than theirs, for while they were convinced that the only hope of safety lay in a rigid anti-Catholic régime, she saw the wisdom of attaching moderates of both parties to her side, realizing that if she committed herself to the ultra-Protestant policy it would inevitably provoke civil and foreign war.

Her Problems and Policy. — The exhausted country was deeply in debt. Two parties of religious extremists were striving for mastery. Mary had been dragged by her Spanish consort into a disastrous war with France, and the French King, with one foot on Calais and another in Scotland, loomed up doubly threatening. Foreign Powers and many of Elizabeth's own subjects held her to be a heretic and no true heir of her father, and Mary, Queen of Scots, the next orthodox heir, was united in marriage to the Dauphin. Spain, too, might conceivably compose her political differences with her northern neighbor and combine in a grand Catholic alliance to crush one of the few remaining outposts of Protestantism. It was the aim of Elizabeth to prevent this. But she sought to achieve her purpose by diplomacy, steering clear of wars and alliances, and contenting herself with occasional — so far as possible secret — aid to the Protestants in Scotland and the Netherlands and the Huguenots in France. There were three reasons: she desired to give her overburdened country a chance to rest and to develop its resources; moreover, she hoped by preserving neutrality to unite all classes of subjects irrespective of party; finally, she was proud of her diplomatic gifts, though her diplomacy was frequently nothing but deceit. Yet, with all her pettiness, Elizabeth had a true love for her people, and in times of stress could rise to the noblest

heights. In general, her hesitating policy was best, since it enabled her to play off conflicting forces one against another, thereby gaining time, the healing properties of which she understood so well. The result was that she left Protestantism established on a secure foundation, she insured a peaceful succession which led to ultimate union with Scotland, she found poverty and strife and left prosperity and national unity.

Peace with France (1559). — One of the new Queen's first steps was to refuse an offer of marriage from Philip II and to declare to Parliament her intention to remain single, which meant that with the help of her people she was to solve her problems independently, not as a province of Spain. In April, 1559, she made peace with France by yielding Calais, a concession which relieved the country of great expense and helped in the withdrawal from foreign complications.

The Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity (1559). — While extricating the State from foreign entanglements Elizabeth also had turned her attention to the religious settlement. By steering a middle course she sought to unite the moderates of both parties against the extremists; moreover, "new-fangledness" repelled her because it stood for popular or clerical control, while Romanism meant subordination to the Pope. Parliament, after a hard struggle, carried in April, 1559, two Acts embodying the Elizabethan Settlement, which, save for a few later modifications, is practically that of the Church of England to-day. By the first of these Acts — popularly known as the "Act of Supremacy" — the reactionary legislation of Mary was repealed and most of the anti-papal laws of Henry VIII were restored. A few of Henry's claims were not revived; for example, in place of the title of "Supreme Head," Elizabeth assumed that of "Supreme Governor" of the Church, thus avoiding offense to the Catholics who recognized only the Pope, and to the Puritans who accepted Christ alone as Head. Obedience to the Act was secured by an oath imposed upon all clergymen and holders of civil office, while those who maintained the authority of any foreign prince or prelate were subject to severe penalties. The second measure, the "Act of Uniformity of Common Prayer," enforced the form of service of a newly revised Prayer Book and prohibited all others. Ministers who disobeyed were punished, and every one refusing to go to church had to pay a fine. Submission to the Established Church was regarded as a test of loyalty to the State; and, in those troublous times, disobedience was regarded as the blackest of crimes. For the time being, the Elizabethan Settlement apparently satisfied all but a few extremists among the rank and file, though the bishops, all but one of whom opposed it, either fled abroad or were de-

prived and imprisoned. Matthew Parker (1504–1575) was consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury in place of Pole. Wise and moderate as well as learned, he desired ever to conciliate, though he was later forced into sharp opposition against the Puritans.

The Triumph of the Scotch Protestants (1559–1560). — No sooner had Elizabeth brought English affairs into some degree of order than she was drawn into the struggle across the Border. John Knox returned to Scotland in 1559 and at once took the lead against the Regent. An attempt to suppress the Protestant preachers furnished the immediate occasion, but back of it was a growing feeling against French influence. The Lords of the Congregation, who furnished Knox's fighting force, applied to Elizabeth for aid. Fearing to go too far lest she might set a precedent for foreign Powers to combine with her Catholic subjects to drive her from her throne, she agreed to assist the Scots in expelling the French, provided they continued to acknowledge their Queen, Mary, wife of Francis II of France.[1] Since the French were fully occupied by internal troubles, and since the masterful Regent died, in June, 1560, the Lords of the Congregation, with such help as they got from the cautious Elizabeth, were able to overcome the Franco-Catholic party. In August, 1560, they called a meeting of the Estates, which renounced the authority of the Pope, and forbade the saying or hearing mass under penalties culminating in death for the third offense.

Mary's Return to Scotland (1561). — In December, 1560, Francis II died, and in August of the following year Mary returned to Scotland. Her guiding aim was to secure the succession to the English throne. Her accomplishments, added to her personal charm, made her well-nigh irresistible, and she was daring, persistent, and unscrupulous as well. In her struggle with Elizabeth, however, she was handicapped by various disadvantages besides inferior resources. Her loves and hates frequently prevailed over her State policy, whereas Elizabeth, equally fearless and unscrupulous, always kept her feelings under control; Elizabeth's interests, too, were generally identical with those of the English people, while Mary looked on the Scotch solely as a means of furthering her own ambitions. In spite of herself, Mary advanced the cause of the Reformation. Her claims to the English throne forced Elizabeth to seek the support of her Protestant subjects and drew patriotic Catholics to her side; it also insured to Protestant England the friendship of Philip II as a counterpoise to Franco-Scotch ascendancy, while a similar fear led Elizabeth to lend effective, if grudging, aid to the Protestant lords.

[1] He succeeded his father, Henry II, July, 1559.

Mary's Marriage to Darnley (1565). — In the course of a few years, partly owing to her winning graces, partly to the repellent austerity of Knox and his ministers, Mary had gained great strength, when suddenly, 29 July, 1565, she married her cousin Lord Darnley. Thus she broke away from her half brother Lord James Stewart,[1] leader of the dominant Protestants, and put herself at the head of the Catholic party in Scotland and England. Her motives in this marriage were political, not romantic; for Darnley was next to herself in the succession and of her own faith. The Catholic cause seemed triumphant. Moray and the Protestant lords, after an unsuccessful appeal to arms, fled to England, and Mary set to work to induce the French and Spanish to sink their political jealousies in a common war for the destruction of Protestantism. She was destined to bitter disappointment.

Darnley's Breach with Mary. His Murder (1567). — Darnley proved weak, dissipated, and presuming. His excesses disgusted the Queen, while he, infuriated at his exclusion from all authority, laid the blame on Mary's secretary David Rizzio. So he was easily persuaded to enter into a bond with the exiled lords to bring them back and dispose of his rival. On 9 March, 1566, he burst into the Queen's chamber in Holyrood Palace, followed by a body of armed men who tore Rizzio from her skirts where he clung for protection, dragged him to the door, stabbed him, and flung his body down the stairs. Mary met the situation with promptness and decision. Feigning reconciliation with her ineffectual Consort, she drew him from his fellow conspirators, and restored to favor such of the Protestant lords as had not been involved in the crime. However, her natural aversion to Darnley was rendered complete by a passionate attachment which she formed for the Earl of Bothwell, a reckless, aspiring noble, who, although a Protestant, was the declared enemy of Moray. It was at this juncture that, 9 February, 1567, Kirk O'Field, the house in which Darnley, just recovering from a serious illness, was lodged, was blown up and his dead body was found in the adjoining garden. Mary, who brought him to the house, had left him, only a few hours before the explosion.

Mary's Flight to England. Her Captivity (1569–1587). — Though Bothwell was accused with one voice, no one dared to appear against him. After his acquittal at a trial which was nothing more than a farce, he took Mary captive, apparently by arrangement planned with her beforehand. Having secured a divorce from his own wife, he and the Queen were married, 15 May, 1567. This outrageous proceeding led to a revolt — in which Mary was overcome. Bothwell escaped while she herself was imprisoned in Lochleven Castle, forced to yield

[1] Earl of Moray in 1562.

the throne to her infant son, James, born 19 June, 1566, and to nominate Moray Regent. She escaped after a few months only to receive another defeat, May, 1568, when, in despair, she fled across the Border, threw herself on the support of Elizabeth, and demanded a hearing against her subjects. After a body of commissioners, representing the two Queens and the rebellious Scots, had delayed for months on the case Elizabeth was able to announce a characteristically indefinite conclusion, blaming neither party. Nevertheless, Mary was held a captive for nearly twenty years. Fortunately for England, the French and Spanish Kings were for a time fully occupied with their own affairs, and, in spite of the danger of rousing the Catholics, Mary proved a valuable hostage.

The Rising of the Northern Earls (1569). — Not long after Mary's arrival in England the plotting began. Thomas, Duke of Norfolk, planned to marry her. Lacking courage to declare himself, he, nevertheless, aroused Elizabeth's suspicions, who had him locked up in the Tower, October, 1569. A fortnight after his arrest a great rebellion broke out in the north. As in the case of the Pilgrimage of Grace, the movement was due to a mixture of religious, political and economic causes. However, the specific demands of the insurgents were the restoration of the old religion, the purging of new men from the Council, the release of Norfolk, and the restoration of Mary to her throne. Once more, however, lack of concert among them proved fatal, with the result that the Queen's army was soon able to restore order. However, a strong party still survived who firmly believed that Elizabeth had no right to rule and that it was their religious duty to put Mary Stuart in her place; they looked to Rome for support, and, when occasion offered, intrigued with Spain and France.

Elizabeth and the Catholics. — Elizabeth sought to meet the Roman Catholic danger in two ways: abroad, by stirring up the Protestant subjects of the rulers whom she feared; at home, by restrictive legislation. She demanded only outward conformity; for, as she proudly declared, she "made no windows into men's souls." Moreover, no one was put to death for religion during the first seventeen years of her reign. Persecution was forced upon her by political necessity. While liberty of worship was forbidden from the first, the restrictions later imposed were due in most cases to aggressions from Rome or to marked successes of the Catholic cause abroad. The events of 1562 illustrate this. The Pope struck a hard blow at the loyalty of the moderate Catholics by a brief in which he denounced the Prayer Book and forbade the faithful to attend the services of the Church of England. In France the Huguenots, or Protestants, met with a series of reverses,

and English troops, which Elizabeth had reluctantly sent to their aid, were driven out of Havre. The result was a series of measures, aimed to offset these papal assertions and gains. So the Forty-two Articles, revised and reduced to thirty-nine, were adopted by Convocation, 1563;[1] while an Act of Parliament extended the Oath of Supremacy to members of the House of Commons, to schoolmasters, and lawyers. Furthermore, the Court of High Commission, authorized by the Act of Supremacy, began actively to inquire into the faith of the clergy.

The Counter-Reformation. — There was still great danger that England might be engulfed in the "Counter-reformation," as the great movement was called by which the Church of Rome sought to reform itself and to recover the countries which had broken away. Practically every spark of heresy was stamped out in Spain and Italy, France was retained by hard fighting, so were ten of the seventeen provinces in the Low Countries, while Poland, Southern Germany, and, later, Bohemia, were all won back. Four main factors played a decisive part in the Roman Catholic renascence. First, zealous and religious Popes were elected. Secondly, the counsels of progressive and high-thinking men began to be heard, who sought to regenerate the Church from within in order to tempt back those who had wandered from the fold. Steps even toward reconciliation with the Lutherans were undertaken by progressive Italian Catholics; but were checked by Francis I who persuaded Paul III that religious unity in Germany would make Charles V dangerously strong. So the question was reserved for a General Council soon to meet at Trent.

Before it came together a new religious order sprang into being, the influence of which prevented all reconciliation.

The Jesuits. — This third and most aggressive factor in the regeneration of the Church — the famous Society of Jesus — was the creation of Ignatius Loyola, a Spanish knight, who developed a wonderful organization, the members of which, pledged to absolute obedience, were to be Christian soldiers in a grand spiritual campaign to convert all outside the pale of the Church and to suppress free thought and inquiry within. The Society received the papal sanction in 1540, and Loyola became its first general in 1541. Training schools and colleges were established; and the Order, which numbered thousands and extended over Europe, Asia, Africa, and America, was divided into provinces, each under a provincial, while the general at Rome wielded power over Popes and Princes.[2]

[1] Ratified by Parliament in 1571.

[2] They were greatly assisted in their work of suppression, by the Inquisition, an institution as old as the twelfth century; but which, with an elaborate or-

The Council of Trent (1545–1563). The Council of Trent, the fourth factor in counteracting the Protestant Reformation, was opened in 1545, and continued its session intermittently till 1563. Here the Jesuits prevailed over the party of mediation. The leading doctrines of Protestantism, such as individual interpretation of the Bible and justification by faith, were condemned; the chief dogmas of the Church were defined more rigidly, the supremacy of the Pope was reaffirmed, glaring abuses were reformed, and stricter discipline was introduced. Thus reformed and reorganized, strengthened by the terrible arm of the Inquisition, the Church of Rome under pious and energetic Popes sought the support of Spain and France, and started anew on its road of recovery and conquest. England, however, who had so much to fear from this powerful combination, was to enjoy a period of respite. Philip II, keen enough to reëstablish the power of the Church, was held back for some years by fear of France, who aimed to extend her power across the Channel by making Mary Stuart Queen of England. During the interval, the French Government was occupied in a series of religious wars with the Huguenots, while Philip himself was called upon to face a revolt of his Protestant subjects in the Netherlands.

The Revolt of the Netherlands (1567). — Charles V had ruled with great moderation, respecting carefully their provincial privileges to which they clung tenaciously; but Philip II, unlike his father, had not been brought up among them and was Spanish to the core. Cold and unbending, he determined to mold them into the vast religious and political system by which he sought to control his dominions in Europe, America, and the Eastern Ocean. The opposition started with a combination of the local nobility, led by William of Orange, against an attempt to ignore their share in the government. Then the activity of the Inquisition in punishing heresy led to their union with the people in a common bond to uproot and expel the iniquitous instrument of oppression. As a result of a great popular outburst, the Regent, who governed for Philip, made certain concessions which led many of the nobles and some of the moderate folk to return to their allegiance, though the Prince of Orange held aloof and withdrew to Germany. Philip, instead of meeting his subjects halfway, adopted the advice of the Duke of Alva, the most uncompromising of his generals, and sent him with Spanish troops to repress and punish those who had presumed to rebel against his authority. Directly on his arrival, in May, 1567, Alva set up a tribunal known as the "Blood Council" to try those concerned in the recent outbreak, and among

ganization of courts and officials, had been particularly active in Spain for about a century.

those put to death were nobles who had renounced the extremists. William of Orange, who during his exile had become a Calvinist, led an army against the savage executioner, but had to withdraw defeated.

The Ridolfi Plot and the Execution of Norfolk (1572).—The cause of Protestantism was exposed to serious menace, and the Protestant cause received another blow from the assassination of Moray, Regent of the Scots, 23 January, 1570 To cap all, the Pope issued a bull of excommunication against Queen Elizabeth. Her reply was a new series of measures against the Catholics. In 1571 Parliament declared it high treason to call the Queen a heretic, to affirm that any particular person was her successor,[1] or to publish any papal bull against her. In this year "Ridolfi's Plot," engineered by a Florentine resident in England, came to light, a plot which, with the aid of Alva, Philip II, and the Pope, aimed to liberate Mary and to marry her to the Duke of Norfolk. Norfolk paid the penalty with his head, 1572. Though the clouds still hung heavy, Elizabeth had already achieved much and was steadily gaining ground. She had settled the religion of her realm, she had helped to set up Protestantism in Scotland, she held her rival captive, she had put down a dangerous rising, and, while Catholicism was gaining ground abroad, the two leading Powers of that faith were at odds with each other and busy repressing religious revolts among their own subjects. Further dangers were in store for England's Queen; but when they came, she proved ready to meet them, backed by the moderate men of both camps who saw that the salvation of their country depended upon united effort.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

Narrative. Pollard; Innes; Lingard; Froude; and *Cambridge Modern History*. Creighton, *Queen Elizabeth* (1909), the best biography of the Queen. Creighton, *The Age of Elizabeth* (6th ed., 1885), a good brief survey. M. A. S. Hume, *The Courtships of Queen Elizabeth* (1896) and *The Great Lord Burghley* (1898) are useful.

For Relations with Scotland. *Cambridge Modern History*, III, ch. VIII (bibliography 810–815) is an able and impartial survey of the Mary Stuart problem. See also P. H. Brown, *Scotland;* Andrew Lang, *History of Scotland* (1900–1902) and W. L. Mathieson, *Politics and Religion* (1902).

J. R. Seeley, *Growth of British Policy* (2 vols., 1895) contains a stimulating and suggestive account of the broader features of the diplomacy of the reign.

Ecclesiastical. In addition to Wakeman and Dixon, W. H. Frere, *History of the English Church*, 1588–1603 (1904). F. Proctor (ed. W. H.

[1] This was of course aimed at Mary and her adherents.

Frere) *New History of the Book of Common Prayer* (1901). H. Gee, *The Elizabethan Prayer Book and Ornaments* (1902). H. N. Birt, *The Elizabethan Religious Settlement* (1907) treats the subject from the Roman Catholic standpoint.

Selections from the sources. Adams and Stephens, nos. 167 ff.; for a more complete selection G. W. Prothero, *Select Statutes and Other Constitutional Documents* (1894, new ed., 1913).

CHAPTER XXV

ELIZABETH'S ASCENDANCY AND DECLINE (1572–1603)

The Massacre of St. Bartholomew (24 August, 1572). — Alva's triumph was short-lived. His bloodthirstiness and his oppressive taxation roused the Netherlanders to fury: encouraged by French and English aid, town after town rebelled, and, in July, 1572, four of the Northern provinces united under William of Orange as Stadholder. One result was a wild assault on the Huguenots in France. That country was practically governed by the masterful Catherine de' Medici, mother of the nominal King Charles IX, who had recently fallen under the influence of Admiral Coligny, the noblest of the Huguenot leaders. Momentarily freed from fear of Spain, Catherine, recoiling at the thought of Protestant ascendancy, combined with the hated Guises[1] to get rid of her son's new mentor and to destroy his followers. The opportunity came when the wedding of Henry of Navarre, 18 August, 1572, brought large numbers of the Huguenot party to Paris. Representing to her feeble-minded son that his throne, his religion, and indeed his life were in danger, Catherine prevailed upon him to order a general massacre, which began in the early morning of St. Bartholomew's Day, 24 August. Coligny was the most notable victim, though few of the leaders, except Henry of Navarre, escaped. The slaughter, spreading from Paris to the other towns of France, lasted for days. England was plunged in deepest gloom, and when the French ambassador succeeded in obtaining an audience he was received by the whole Court in mourning.

The Union of Utrecht (1579). — Alva, now that the Netherlands were cut off from French help, hoped to crush them utterly; but his ruthless methods only stirred them to more desperate resistance. Philip, in despair, soon recalled him, and sent a successor pledged to a more pacific policy. The French Government, too, were not long in recognizing the futility of the policy of bloodshed, and sought to conciliate the Huguenots by a new edict of toleration. In the Neth-

[1] A powerful Lorraine family who furnished many Roman Catholic leaders in Church and State.

erlands the new Governor, Alexander of Parma, managed to break up the combination of the seventeen provinces by artfully fomenting religious dissension. The ten southern, prevailingly Catholic, formed a separate union and gradually fell back to Spain, while the seven northern, by the Union of Utrecht, 1579, combined under William of Orange, and ultimately, after an heroic struggle, achieved their independence, which was finally acknowledged in 1648.

Roman Catholic Movements against Elizabeth in Ireland and Scotland. — In view of the large number of disaffected in Ireland, Scotland, and Wales a plan was concocted by certain English exiles, with the sanction of the Pope, to strike at Queen Elizabeth in all those three centers simultaneously. Ireland offered a peculiarly favorable field. While Henry VIII had alienated many by his attempts to bribe the chiefs with tribal lands, attempts in Mary's reign to plant English settlers in western Leinster had only increased the bitterness. The natives were in constant turmoil, and the English officials, strong enough for oppression and extortion, had not sufficient forces to maintain order. In consequence, Irishmen listened eagerly to papal emissaries who promised deliverance from tyranny. However, a joint invasion and rising, centering in Kerry, in 1579, led by two brothers of the powerful House of Desmond, and supported, with the sanction of Gregory XIII, by a few Spanish and Italian troops, was ruthlessly suppressed by a new Lord Deputy, an achievement which Elizabeth joyfully acknowledged as an act of God. Followed by devastations and seizures, its only result was to widen the breach between England and her subject people. In Scotland an attempt at a Catholic revival was made through Esmé Stuart, sent in 1579 by the Guises with the design of converting James VI and restoring the French alliance. Easily gaining a complete ascendancy over the young King, who created him Duke of Lennox, he was for some months virtually master of Scotland, and was on the point of calling in a force of Spanish troops when, in August, 1582, a group of nobles seized King James while hunting and forced him to order Lennox to leave the country. After a period of aimless lingering the defeated intriguer withdrew to France, where he died soon after.

The Seminary Priests and Jesuits in England (1579–1581). — The third center of attack was in England itself. Among other evidences of the zeal inspired by the Jesuits was the founding of a Seminary at Douay (soon transferred to Rheims) and of a college at Rome for the training of English Catholics. Burning with enthusiasm, the Englishmen who went from them [1] strove to convert their Protestant

[1] Known as "seminary priests" when they took Holy Orders.

countrymen and to arouse the native Catholics from their lethargy. In June, 1581, a mission led by two Jesuits, Edmund Campion, a high-minded enthusiast of captivating eloquence, and Robert Parsons, a restless intriguer, landed in England. Moving from place to place in disguise they preached to large crowds, they set up a printing press, circulated controversial pamphlets, and converted considerable numbers. Alarmed at their success, the Government passed an Act of Parliament which declared it high treason to convert the Queen's subjects to the Church of Rome or to aid or to conceal those engaged in such work. Heavy fines were imposed on any priest who said mass or on any one who refused [1] to go to Church. A rigid persecution was begun; houses were searched for concealed priests; Campion and some of the other Jesuits were captured and put to death; but Parsons escaped and troubled the Government for years to come.

Further Measures against the Roman Catholics (1584–1593). — The discovery, in 1583, of another plot to put Mary on the throne with foreign aid, and the assassination of William the Silent,[2] in July, 1584, led to the formation of a voluntary association to protect the Queen, which was legalized by Parliament early in 1585. Another Act ordered all Jesuits and seminary priests to quit the realm within forty days and declared any found thereafter, or any who had harbored them, guilty of high treason. The final anti-Catholic Act of the reign, passed in 1593, provided that recusants of the wealthier sort should be forbidden to travel more than five miles from their homes [3] and that those of the poorer class should be banished.

The Protestant Extremists. — Meantime, since the beginning of the reign, the extreme Protestants had been giving serious trouble. Three classes may be distinguished: the Puritans or moderate Nonconformists, who wanted to stay in the Church, but desired to "purify" its services from forms and ceremonies savoring of Rome; the Presbyterians, who aimed to substitute their form of government for the Episcopal form established by law; finally, the Separatists or Brownists, called Independents or Congregationalists in a later time, who insisted on the right of each congregation to manage its own affairs. Differing among themselves on many fundamental points, they agreed in denouncing what they regarded as "Romish" forms and ceremonies. The Puritans, who objected to the vestments prescribed

[1] Such persons were called "recusants." The fine, £20 a month, too heavy to be enforced, was intended mainly as a threat.

[2] The popular name for William of Orange.

[3] They were retained as a source of revenue from the fines which might be imposed.

for the clergy, and to various forms and ceremonies, such as the observance of saints' days, the sign of the Cross in baptism, and organ music, opened the fight in Convocation, in 1563. Failing to secure any concessions, they began to meet in "conventicles," where they held services according to their own rules, instead of those laid down in the Prayer Book. Elizabeth desired to avoid trouble, but they flouted the ritual to which she was attached; their contempt of form and denunciation of amusements were unpalatable to the majority of her subjects; and they defied royal authority. Accordingly, she insisted on the observance of the forms of worship by law established.

The Presbyterians. — Later, the Presbyterians entered the field with an onslaught upon the very structure of the Episcopal church. In two "Admonitions to Parliament," in 1572, they denounced the government of bishops as contrary to the word of God and demanded government by presbyters. Not only were their views startlingly democratic but their language was immeasurably violent. A mild sample is their description of the Archbishop's court as "the filthy quagmire and poisoned splash of all abominations that do infect the whole realm." The advent of the Separatists about the same time added another element of confusion. In 1583 the Court of High Commission was put on a permanent footing with enlarged powers, though for ten years previously it had been active in enforcing the Act of Uniformity against Protestants as well as Catholics. On the other hand, Archbishop Parker's successor had to be suspended for refusing to suppress meetings of those of advanced views, while Whitgift, an orthodox and energetic prelate who followed him, 1583, was greatly hampered from the fact that extreme Protestantism had secured strong sympathizers in the Council and Parliament.

The Marprelate Libels (1588). — Attempts at repression only embittered the extremists, who replied with violent abuse which reached its height in the Martin Marprelate libels, in 1588. In them the Archbishop was graced with such names as "Beelzebub of Canterbury, the Canterbury Caiaphas; Esau, a monstrous anti-Christ; a most bloody oppressor of God's saints." The bishops were: "false governors of the Church, petty popes; proud, popish, profane, presumptuous, paltry, pestilent, pernicious prelates, and usurpers; enemies of God and the State." The clergy were: "popish priests, ale hunters, drunkards, dolts, hogs, dogs, wolves, desperate and forlorn atheists, a crew of bloody soul murderers, sacrilegious church robbers." These pronouncements of certain hot zealots, "who for Zion's sake could not hold their peace," were bound to hurt

the cause of the earnest, moderate men opposed to the Elizabethan State Church. Indeed, the very year in which the libels appeared marked a reaction toward the Establishment, to which many other circumstances contributed. For one thing, numbers came to realize that it was both graceless and futile to engender strife against a Sovereign who, however sternly she repressed extremists, had done so much for the Protestant cause; she was growing old and they could wait to push their claims under a successor to whom they were not bound by such ties of gratitude. To dispose of the irreconcilables, Parliament, in response to a royal demand, passed, 1593, an Act "against seditious sectaries and disloyal persons," providing, among other things, that those who frequented conventicles or assailed the royal supremacy in matters ecclesiastical should abjure the realm and never return under pain of death. In the same year three, including Penry, the chief author of the Marprelate libels, suffered for their faith, though the cause assigned was malicious defaming of the Queen with intent to stir up rebellion.

Elizabeth's Intervention in the Netherlands (1585). — Doubtless the chief reason for harmonizing religious differences was the necessity of meeting a great invasion sent by Philip II, and the burst of loyalty which followed its triumphant repulse. The attack was due mainly to two causes: English intervention in the Netherlands and the aggressiveness of the English sea power. With the murder of William of Orange and the continued successes of Alexander of Parma, the cause of the Netherlands seemed to be doomed, particularly when the childless Henry III of France, allowing his religious sentiments to triumph over his fear of Spain, joined Philip II, 1585, to exclude from the French throne his heir Henry of Navarre, leader of the Huguenots, and to extirpate Protestantism in France and the Low Countries. Elizabeth, who had hitherto lent only enough assistance to the revolt to keep it alive, saw that the time for active intervention had come. She refused the offer of sovereignty, though, with her accustomed thrift, she demanded from the Dutch certain "cautionary towns" as pledges for expenses incurred. Toward the end of 1585 Leicester was sent over with a force of foot and horse. Thoroughly incompetent, cramped from lack of funds, and opposed by Parma, the greatest general of the time, he accomplished nothing, and wags put in his mouth the words, *veni, vidi, redii*.[1] Leicester's futile expedition is only important as a leading cause of Philip's attack on England.

The Rise of the Elizabethan Sea Power. — More alarming to the

[1] "I came, I saw, I returned," a brilliant distortion of Caesar's famous, *veni, vidi, vici*.

Spanish King than the English intervention in the Netherlands were the attacks of English seamen upon his commerce and his American possessions. Since the accession of Elizabeth the maritime power of the country had sprung into a stage of growth which ultimately brought it to a height unequaled in the world's history. Although the royal navy was developing, this was the peculiar work of the explorers and of sea-rovers or privateers, recruited from the merchant marine. They braved the perils of unknown seas and unknown lands, they broke through the colonial and commercial monopoly of Spain, and strove as well to strike deadly blows at Philip's world-wide religious and political domination. Thus fame and booty, the profit and glory of England, and the defense and spread of Protestantism mingled curiously and effectively to spur them on. And in the Queen they found a persistent if shifty supporter, for she shared in their profits and gained by their victories. Though her policy was in essence defensive — to preserve national independence and Protestantism — she sought to realize it, to a considerable degree, by offensive means. She had no mind to declare war; but she sent aid to the Dutch in revolt, first "underhand" and at length openly, and from the beginning of her reign she steadily kindled the enthusiasm of her subjects for buccaneering enterprises against the Spanish commerce and the Spanish colonies, though protesting, all the while, that she was not responsible for the acts of her subjects.

The English Buccaneers and Their Aggressions against Spain. — The pioneer of the Elizabethan "sea-dogs" was John Hawkins, who initiated the traffic in slaves from the Guinea coast of Africa to Spanish America, the Queen, it is shameful to relate, sharing in his profits. His young cousin Francis Drake accompanied him on his second voyage and commanded a ship on a third and more famous one, in 1567, when they were attacked in the Mexican port of San Juan d'Ulloa,[1] whence they escaped only after the bulk of their crew had been massacred. While they had given great provocation, the act was a piece of deliberate treachery[2] and determined Drake to devote the remainder of his life to a relentless war against Spain and her possessions in the new world. In his famous voyage round the world, 1577–1580, Drake marked his course by devastation and plunder; yet the magnitude of his achievement and the fortitude which he

[1] The roadstead of Vera Cruz.

[2] Elizabeth replied to the incident at San Juan by seizing, in December, 1568, Genoese ships laden with Spanish treasure for the Duke of Alva in the Netherlands, a step which, with amazing effrontery, she justified on the ground that, having saved it from the privateers, she was entitled to take it as a loan.

displayed amply merited the acclaim which greeted him on his return. Elizabeth economically rewarded him with a knighthood for the share of treasure which he brought her. Trembling for the safety of his lands and trade, Philip for some years had sought to check Elizabeth's aggressions by seizing ships in Spanish waters. Her reply was to send privateers to the scene of action. Most disastrous to the enemy was the activity of Drake, in 1585. Striking first at the coast of Spain he seized a quantity of shipping; thence he passed to the West Indies and the Spanish Main, overcoming great cities, and plundering and destroying as he went. The simultaneous operations of Drake and Leicester led Philip to plan a joint attack on England from Spain and the Netherlands. Under cover of a fleet, Parma was to land an army, the English Catholics were to rise for Mary, Elizabeth was to be disposed of, and Parma was to marry the new Queen and to govern the country for his master.

Babington's Plot (1586). **Execution of Mary.** — The miscarriage of Babington's plot in behalf of Mary, 1586, shattered this project, but furnished Philip with another pretext for invading England. Mary was brought to trial and sentenced to death. After two months of vacillation and after she had made a vain effort to induce Mary's keeper to murder his royal captive, Elizabeth finally signed the death-warrant and handed it over to a Secretary without, however, giving him any authority to carry it out. By order of the Council who assumed the responsibility, Mary Stuart was beheaded, 8 February, 1587, going to her death with magnificent fortitude. Elizabeth protested to France and Scotland that she was innocent of the deed and, as a proof of her good faith, fined and dismissed the poor Secretary.

The Sailing of the Armada (1588). — Before Philip, now the avenger of Mary's death and the claimant[1] to the English throne, had completed his ponderous preparations, the terrible Drake assumed the offensive. Sailing from Plymouth harbor, in April, 1587, he made for Cadiz, plundered the town, and destroyed a vast amount of stores and shipping, darted thence to Lisbon Bay, creating havoc with the fleet which the Spanish commander was making ready, and then intercepted, off Cape St. Vincent, a squadron of transports from the Mediterranean. This exploit, which is called "singeing the King of Spain's beard," frustrated Philip's plans for that year. At length, in May, 1588, the great Armada was ready to sail; but at the very outset it encountered a furious storm off Lisbon which so crippled

[1] Mary before her death had disinherited her son James in his favor as a claimant. Philip based his claim on his descent from a marriage of John of Gaunt with a Portuguese princess.

and scattered the ships that the second and final start was delayed till 12 July.

Comparative Strength of the English and Spanish Fleets. — At least three serious obstacles confronted the invaders. Parma's army was blockaded by a Dutch fleet and that blockade would have to be broken; then it was necessary to overcome the English in the Channel in order to convey his army across; finally, Parma, if he succeeded in landing, would have to conquer the country — in all probability, in the teeth of opposition even from the Catholics. The critical struggle took place in the Channel, and in spite of the terror of the Spanish name and the imposing appearance of the Spanish fleet, the English captains anticipated a victory from the outset. Elizabeth, to be sure, was not well prepared, for she had hoped to avert war; but her commander, Lord Howard of Effingham, was a man of experience, prudence, and valor, and had some of the most brilliant sea fighters of the age to help him. The Spanish fleet numbered 130 ships with a total tonnage and an equipment of men and guns double the English. On the other hand, while the English royal navy counted only 34 ships, others contributed by the nobles, the gentry, and the seaports, brought their aggregate up to 197. Moreover, the Spanish galleons were high fore and aft, offering excellent marks for the English gunners, and, drawing little water, they were unable to move rapidly — a serious impediment to their classic style of fighting, which consisted of closing with the enemy and making use of their superior numbers in hand-to-hand encounters. The English ships, lighter and better handled, kept the weather gauge, and firing three times to the enemy's one, poured their shot with deadly effect into their lofty exposed hulls. The clumsy Spanish, on their part, wasted their fire in a vain effort to disable the vessels that they could not reach, by aiming at their rigging.

The Camp at Tilbury. — The English land forces were gathered at Tilbury where Elizabeth appeared before them mounted on a war horse, holding a general's staff, and arrayed in a breastplate of steel. Followed by a page who bore her helmet, she rode bareheaded through the ranks, and roused them to the highest pitch of loyalty by her stirring words. "I am come among you at this time," she said, "being resolved . . . to lay down for my God and for my Kingdom, and for my people, my honour and my blood, even in the dust. I know that I have but the body of a feeble woman, but I have the heart of a King and a King of England too." No wonder they prayed heartily the Spaniards might land quickly, and "when they knew they were fled, they began to lament."

The Destruction of the Armada. — On 19 July, 1588, the long-expected Armada was first sighted off the Cornish coast. Repulsed in a series of engagements in the waters about Portsmouth and the Isle of Wight, the invaders started up the Channel to join Parma. When they reached Calais the English turned loose a number of fire ships, scattering the Spanish vessels in all directions; before they had time to recover, they were engaged by the English fleet in force and obliged to break and flee. The victors, however, were in no condition to pursue them, for their ammunition was exhausted, their provisions had run short, and what remained was spoiled — a mishap due partly to the faulty and inadequate supply system of those days and partly to Elizabeth's parsimony. The "invincible Armada" sped north driven by a stiff gale, rounding the north of Scotland and the west of Ireland; about half of the original force finally reached Spain. Beside those lost in fighting, many were wrecked, of whom numbers, cast alive on the Scotch and Irish shores, were slain by the natives or by English officials. Wind and weather had fought against the proud Spaniard, yet, after all has been said, the result was chiefly due to the courage and skill of Elizabeth's seamen.

Significance of the Repulse of the Armada. — While the Armada had never seemed so formidable to English seamen as to the Catholic Powers of the Continent, its repulse marked a grandly significant moment in the history of England. It justified at home and abroad Elizabeth's wise policy of moderation. She had won her people with peace, light taxes, and the fostering of trade, and had prosecuted religious extremists only so far as necessities of State demanded. When the crisis came her subjects, forgetting their religious differences, flocked to the defense of their Sovereign and their Kingdom. And the victory was not only an indication, it was also a further cause of national unity. Achievement in a common national undertaking drew more closely together subjects of all shades of opinion. For the first time, too, it revealed to Christendom the greatness of English sea power and marked the beginning of the end of the Spanish sea power, one of the leading causes of Spanish ultimate downfall.

New Aggressions against Spain and the Final Stages of the Struggle with Philip II. — The younger generation were thirsting for great exploits. Not content with preying upon Spain's commerce and worrying her with occasional dashes against her coasts, they aspired to break up her dominion beyond the seas and to set up an English dominion in its place. At the head of this party stood Essex, a nephew of Leicester, and Raleigh, who wanted to override the older, wiser, and more cautious councilors like Burghley and Walsingham. A futile

expedition, in 1589, for the purpose of restoring a Portuguese claimant to the throne of Portugal is an instance of their extreme aggressive policy. In August, 1589, Henry III was assassinated, whereupon Henry of Navarre was able to fight his way to the throne, while the assistance which Philip II and Parma vainly sent to his opponents gave England and the Netherlands a happy respite. In 1593 Henry IV, as he now was, declared himself a Catholic; but this was only for State purposes, and, in 1598, by the Edict of Nantes he granted a generous toleration to Huguenots. Already, more than a year earlier, after Philip's forces captured Calais, he joined the English in an expedition which sacked Cadiz and destroyed the shipping in the harbor. This was the last great naval expedition of the reign against Spain. Burghley succeeded in persuading the Queen to make his son, Robert, Secretary of State, and the peace party was able to put a check upon the fiery Essex faction. Philip, in 1596 and 1597, sent fleets against England and Ireland successively, but neither reached its destination. In 1598 Henry IV concluded a peace with Spain which made Philip free to pursue his designs on England and the Netherlands, but he died the very same year, leaving a bankrupt and crumbling heritage.

Elizabeth's Last Years. — The repulse of the Armada marked the climax of Elizabeth's glory. The years that followed were years of increasing loneliness and isolation. Her favorites and her trusted councilors dropped off one by one: Leicester in 1588; Walsingham in 1590; Burghley in 1598.[1] The system which she represented had outlived its time; the old absolutism had served its turn, and new men and new policies were eagerly waiting their chance. The romance, too, of her life was ended; for even at Court her popularity declined with her fading charms. The admiration of the younger courtiers came to be more and more a pretense. Yet, old as she was, she refused to face the prospect of death or to provide for the succession, and clung to vain display till the last. Once when the Bishop of St. David's ventured to preach on the text, "Lord, teach us to number our days that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom," she burst out stormily: "He might have kept his arithmetic to himself, but I see that the greatest clerks are not the wisest men." Yet, too, there were times when she showed flashes of that tact and insight which had been so characteristic of her in her prime. In 1601 when Parliament forced

[1] Essex was beheaded, in 1601, in consequence of an armed uprising against his Court opponents, to whom he attributed an humiliating sentence to imprisonment in his house, after he had burst into the royal presence unannounced on his return from Ireland, where he failed to deal effectively with a rebellion he was sent to quell. Elizabeth never recovered from the shock of signing his death warrant.

her to revoke some grants of monopolies, regarded as burdensome, she yielded very gracefully, and declared: "I have more cause to thank you all than you me; for, had I not received a knowledge from you, I might have fallen into the lap of an error only from lack of true information." Yet, when the subject had been raised four years earlier, she had expressed the hope that her loving subjects would not take away her prerogative, and had done nothing.

Elizabeth's Death (24 March, 1603). — Elizabeth died 24 March, 1603, in the forty-sixth year of a reign, which, judged by its achievements, was most notable. She maintained the established religion without civil war and kept England from being absorbed either by the House of Valois or the House of Hapsburg. By preventing the question of the succession from being decided prematurely, she peacefully prepared the way for the Scotch Protestant line and the union of two countries that naturally belonged together. While she kept England out of war she diverted its energies into trade, exploration, and colonization, thus helping to lay the foundations of its future greatness. She was blessed with a long reign in which she labored to educate her people into a sense of unity and national self-consciousness. She trusted to time which, though it was ruthless to her as a woman, blessed her policy.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

M. A. S. Hume, *Treason and Plot* (1901) deals with the struggles of the Roman Catholics for supremacy in the last years of Elizabeth. E. P. Cheyney, *A History of England from the Defeat of the Armada to the Death of Elizabeth* (vol. I, 1914) is the most thorough account of the history of the period.

See also the references for ch. XXIV above.

CHAPTER XXVI

ELIZABETHAN ENGLAND (1558–1603)

The Strength of the Later Elizabethan Monarchy. — After Elizabeth had weathered the storms of the first part of her reign, the Monarchy seemed to be even stronger than under her triumphant father. Necessity, sentiment, and gratitude all contributed to this apparent result. The Protestants of every shade of opinion had been forced to support her through fear of civil war and foreign invasion. They clung to her against Mary Stuart, backed by France and the Papacy and, at length, by Spain. After Mary's death the moderate Catholics ranged themselves on Elizabeth's side against the Spanish invasion and the conquest which it threatened to involve. The sentiment of chivalrous devotion to a woman, although it took absurdly extravagant forms, particularly at Court, was another real source of strength that the Queen, not from vanity alone, knew how to foster. Finally, the gentry and the commercial and trading classes were bound to the throne by ties of material interest and gratitude. Henry VII had done much for them; Henry VIII, continuing his father's policy, had shared with them the spoils of the monasteries and contributed to their prosperity in other ways; under Elizabeth came peace, economical rule, depredations against Spain, and the expansion of trade, together with the glorious deliverance of 1588.

Opposition and Sources of Weakness. — Nevertheless, forces were already at work which indicated that absolutism was tottering. A new order of things was inevitable, though it was precipitated by the advent of the Stuart dynasty. The very services rendered by the Tudors, and particularly by Elizabeth, had put the subjects of the realm in a position to assert themselves. They no longer feared the old nobility who had oppressed them in the past and had been responsible for the terrible disorders of the fifteenth century; they were no longer threatened with a Catholic successor; the combination between France and Scotland had been broken by the union of the English and Scotch crowns; Spain had been repulsed and the Romanist party

had shrunk to a faction of plotters who were looked at askance by the loyal members of their own communion; and Ireland, long a storm center, seemed for the moment quelled.[1] The grievances, actual and potential, against which the disaffected could now assert themselves, were both religious and political. While religious strife practically ceased after the Armada, the extreme Protestants had not been crushed; they were only waiting more auspicious times. Since the bishops and their followers among the clergy turned to the Crown for support and sought to strengthen their position by exalting the royal prerogative, their opponents turned to Parliament, combining with those whose grievances were primarily political, with those who were opposed to arbitrary taxation and to the jurisdiction of the extraordinary courts which had grown up under the Tudors. In order to follow the conflict in the two following reigns, it is necessary to understand the situation in Church and State on the eve of the struggle.

The Royal Supremacy over the Church. — The Sovereign was supreme governor over all ecclesiastical persons and causes, and, directly or indirectly, controlled the legislation, administration, and revenues of the Church. Convocation was summoned and dissolved by the Crown, and none of its acts were valid without the royal assent, while the administration of ecclesiastical finances[2] and justice was under royal control from the fact that the bishops were appointees of the Crown. The regular Church courts were those of the Archdeacon, the Bishop, and the Archbishop. Their competence extended over temporal as well as spiritual causes; for, in addition to sacrilege, heresy, perjury, and immorality, probate and divorce fell within their scope.[3] Appeals in the last instance went to the High Court of Delegates, composed of judges appointed by the Sovereign whenever need arose.[4] Until 1641, however, the ordinary ecclesiastical courts were practically superseded by the Court of High Commission, empowered by the Act of Supremacy to exercise ecclesiastical jurisdiction, to inquire into and punish heresy and other offenses of a like nature. At first its energies were devoted to enforcing the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity against the Romanists; but, when it came to be used against the Protestants as well, it began to be hated more and more, until it was finally suppressed. Moreover, its procedure was most oppres-

[1] In 1602 by Essex's successor Lord Mountjoy.

[2] Among various revenues derived from the clergy were first fruits and tenths, clerical subsidies voted in Convocation, and occasional benevolences.

[3] Their jurisdiction over matrimonial and testamentary cases was taken away in 1857.

[4] In 1833 its duties were transferred to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

sive; for it dispensed with juries, and, by the so-called *ex officio* oath, it could oblige the accused to answer any question that might be put to him, quite contrary to the fundamental provision of common law that no man could be obliged to testify against himself.

The Crown and Parliament. — From the break with Rome the Tudors had used Parliament as an instrument of government. Elizabeth's most notable acts, though framed by herself and her councilors, all received parliamentary sanction. But the right of summoning, proroguing, and dissolving were in her hands, and she preferred to summon that body as infrequently as possible. Moreover, when it was called together, the Sovereign had various means of controlling its composition and workings. In the Upper House the Bishops, composing a third of the total membership, were royal nominees. The temporal peers, of whom there were about sixty, could be controlled by favor, by new creations, and promotions. Elizabeth relied rather on favors than appointments.[1] The membership in the Lower House could be regulated by the establishing of new boroughs.[2] Sixty-two date from Elizabeth's reign, some from the sparsely inhabited Cornish districts; but, in general, there was little corruption for Crown purposes; the increase of representation was a natural outcome of increase of population and a reliance on the support of the middle classes. Besides, it was easy to control Parliament in other ways. When roads were few and bad and the postal service inadequate and when public meetings and caucuses were unknown, no effective opposition could be organized outside, nor, with such short and infrequent sessions, was much to be feared from the disaffected after they had assembled. Furthermore, the names of the members were known to the Government before they were to each other; important measures were introduced by the royal councilors; and the election of the Speaker was controlled by the Crown. If, in spite of all, an opposition member appeared dangerous, Elizabeth would forbid his attendance or order his imprisonment; also she might prohibit the discussion of an unpopular bill, or withdraw it in the midst of a discussion. In the last instance she could resort to the veto.

The Privy Council. — Under Elizabeth the actual government was not in Parliament, but in the hands of the Privy Council, which numbered seventeen or eighteen members, mostly laymen, nominated by the Queen. Its functions were threefold; executive or administrative, legislative, and judicial, and its business extended over a most

[1] Henry VII created or promoted 20; Henry VIII, 66; Edward, 22; Mary, 9; Elizabeth, 29.

[2] Henry VIII had created 5; Edward, 22; and Mary, 14.

varied field — local government, industry, and trade, Irish, colonial, and foreign affairs. Legislation was exercised by means of ordinances or proclamations. Emanating usually from the Sovereign, they were executed by means of administrative orders issued by the Secretary (or Secretaries, for there were generally two) who had come to supersede the Chancellor as the chief officer of State. Judicial functions were exercised in the Star Chamber sessions. Altogether, the system of government by Council was very simple and workable and might be very oppressive under a despotic ruler. It framed and executed its own measures, and even on occasion tried cases arising from them.

Revenues and Taxation. Ordinary Crown Revenues. — Taxation formed a leading issue in the coming struggle, partly because the subject wished to protect his purse, and partly because the control of supply was an effective weapon against absolutism. In ordinary times the Sovereign was expected "to live of its own"; but the Crown revenues were far from adequate. Elizabeth, with all her economy, left a debt. The ordinary revenues, largely under royal control, were derived from several sources — Crown lands, feudal dues, court fees and fines, and customs duties, especially tonnage and poundage. In addition to tonnage and poundage and the hereditary customs, the Crown claimed the right to levy certain additional duties known as "impositions," though the Tudors, in contrast to their two successors, employed these largely to regulate trade.

Monopolies, Benevolences, and Forced Loans. — Certain other royal exactions were resisted even under the popular Tudors. There were monopolies, though Elizabeth abolished some of the more objectionable patents, in 1601. Then there were benevolences[1] and forced loans. Elizabeth, however, rarely if ever exacted benevolences; as to forced loans, while Henry VIII, with parliamentary sanction, repudiated most of his, Elizabeth usually repaid hers, though not often in money.

Extraordinary Grants by Parliament. — Extraordinary grants imposed by direct taxation were wholly in the hands of Parliament. They were of two sorts. (1) Tenths and fifteenths, consisting originally of a tenth of the income of burgesses and a fifteenth from the shires, came to be fixed in the fourteenth century at £39,000 for each assessment, and, owing to exemptions and other causes, grew to be very unequal in its distribution. (2) Less early in origin was another form of direct tax — the subsidy. Originally this term had been used

[1] The Tudor Henrys had revived benevolences — which Richard III had abolished in 1484 — on the ground that, as a usurper, his legislation was invalid. They maintained also that they were not taxes but gifts.

loosely as a name for additional customs; in its later and stricter sense it meant a parliamentary tax of 4*s* in the £ on land, and 2*s* 8*d* on goods, though, by the time of Elizabeth, a subsidy had become fixed at about £80,000. Unable to secure adequate grants from the taxes under the control of Parliament, the two rulers who followed Elizabeth resorted, with disastrous consequences, to the irregular devices already in existence, but sparingly used by their predecessor.

The Justices of the Peace and the Common Law Courts. — Only less fruitful in precipitating the conflict to come was the arbitrary jurisdiction exercised by the various special courts set up during the Tudor period. Just as the High Commission came to supplant the regular Church courts, so these extraordinary tribunals superseded, to a large degree, the normal judicial system. Lowest in the scale of the latter were the justices of the peace, chosen by the Chancellor from the landed gentry in the counties and from the magistrates in cities and boroughs. A single justice could commit; but it required two for a judicial decision. In such petty sessions, as they came to be called, they dealt with minor criminal cases, while more important ones were reserved for sittings of the justices of the whole county, known as Quarter Sessions, because they were held four times a year. Next above the Quarter Sessions were the Assizes held at the county seat and presided over by one of the King's justices, assisted by such of the local justices as were commissioned to sit with him. Above the Assizes were the three Common Law Courts sitting at Westminster.[1] The Court of King's Bench and the Court of Common Pleas had each a chief justice and three associate or puisne judges; the judges in the Exchequer Court were called barons. The Court of Exchequer Chamber was a court of still higher resort, consisting of certain of the judges who had not previously heard the case, and, occasionally, a specially important case would be referred to all twelve judges at the start. In the last instance a case went either to the Privy Council or the House of Lords. Even over these Common Law courts the Sovereign had great control; for their judges were appointed by the Crown, usually during pleasure, though Elizabeth was careful not to abuse her powers.

The Special Jurisdictions. — Of the special courts, Chancery, of course, greatly antedated the Tudors. Primarily designed to decide questions of equity, its jurisdiction was often employed to invade the proper field of the Common Law courts. Among the Tudor creations were certain local courts modeled after Star Chamber, notably the President and Council in the North Parts and the Council of Wales

[1] It was their judges who held the Assizes when the central courts were not in session. England was divided into several circuits for the purpose.

and the Marches, set up in 1539 and 1542 respectively for dealing with disturbances on the Borders. Other bodies were established for dealing with particular branches of the revenue, such as the Court of Wards and Liveries. In most cases their original purpose was justified; but their powers were greatly abused, and few of them survived the Puritan Revolution.

Local Government. — The Elizabethan period is especially important in the history of local government; for one thing, it was the system in which the American colonists were trained and which they developed in their new homes. Old organs were losing much of their vitality. The sheriff, for instance, was deprived of most of his importance; his military duties as head of the county militia, organized to deal with insurrection and invasion, were taken over by the Lord Lieutenant — a county official dating from Edward VI,[1] while his judicial and administrative duties passed to the justices of the peace. Beginning with the Statutes of Laborers, it became the work of the latter to license beggars, to force the sturdy to work and to repress vagrants; with the passage of the poor laws and the recusancy acts, more burdens were laid upon them, such as regulation of wages and prices, management of roads and prisons; while subsequent "stacks of statutes" weighed them down with innumerable duties, which, on the whole, they discharged effectually.

The smallest administrative division was the parish, which looked after the maintenance of the church services; had the care of the roads within its borders; and was responsible for the support of its poor, levying rates for each of these purposes. Each parish furnished its quota for the Lord Lieutenant's levy and was intrusted with police powers exercised by elected constables. Some parishes too supported or helped to support schools. Business was transacted in parish meetings under the charge of church wardens, assisted by a committee ranging from eight to twenty-four members. The whole was known as a vestry, which was generally a close corporation, *i.e.* vacancies were filled by surviving members. The city and borough governments were growing equally oligarchical throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Thus, from the Council to the parish, there was a complete but well-knit system of administration, in which, however, none but the select few had any share.

Material Conditions. — Except for the humbler folk, the Elizabethan period was one of increased prosperity, of improved methods of farming, of the growth of manufactures, of the extension of trade and commerce. The Queen's wise measures — her restoration of the coinage,

[1] His military powers were not taken away till 1871.

her peaceful policy, economy, and light taxes, and her encouragement of exploration and maritime enterprise — were greatly favored by circumstances. England, as a wool-producing country, was bound, in the long run, to prevail as a manufacturer of cloth. The necessity of feeding those engaged in the new industry made arable farming again profitable. Moreover, from her position on the very threshold of the Atlantic seaboard, it was inevitable that the Island Kingdom should profit by the discovery of the New World and the new trade routes. Also, the revolt of the Netherlands and the ruin of Antwerp gave London and the other English commercial cities opportunities which they were not slow to seize.

The Restoration of the Coinage. — The disorganization of the currency, begun under Henry VIII, continued through the next reign, and Mary, in spite of well-meant efforts, was able to accomplish little toward remedying the evils. It remained for Elizabeth to overcome the "hideous monster of base money." She called in the debased coins at a figure far below that at which they circulated and somewhat less than their real value, issuing, in their place, pure new coins. The extension of credit combined with the improved currency to help the growth of business. Discarding the old notion that all lending at interest was usurious and wrong, both Henry VIII and Elizabeth recognized the legality of moderate interest.[1] Owing to the policy of mercantilism, to the expansion of trade and commerce, and to the privateering against Spain, prices kept rising; but the rise was of a healthier sort than that due to scarcity and debased money. Since rents and wages went up more slowly, the landlords and laborers did not feel the change so fully or so quickly as the merchant and manufacturer, though the increasing demand for the products of the soil steadily improved the condition of the landed gentry and gave the laborers more regular employment. Many of the former, too, invested in trading and buccaneering enterprises which brought them large returns. Prosperity had developed to such a point in 1569 that the Government which had hitherto borrowed abroad placed a loan at home.

Development of Agriculture. — There was a marked revival of farming in Elizabeth's reign. Country gentlemen began again to turn their attention to the cultivation of their estates, agricultural writers discussed improved methods, while new sources of profit began to arise from market gardening. Sheep raising, however, had to contend against various obstacles; not only was the practice of enclosing still discouraged by law, but also there was a decline in

[1] In 1571 it was fixed at 10 per cent.

the price of wool, possibly owing to a temporary over-stocking of the market, more likely because rich pasturage [1] coarsened the quality. In addition to the growth of population and the increasing demand for food supplies, the policy of the Queen contributed greatly to favor the revival of tillage. When the price of corn was moderate she encouraged its export in the interest of the farmer and the shipper; only in times of scarcity was export checked in the interest of the consumer. One exception, however, was made on political grounds; after hostilities opened with Spain no foodstuffs could be sent to that kingdom at all. New and better roads opened new markets at home, more attention was paid to fertilizing, and with the revival of market gardening, onions, cabbages, carrots, and parsnips began to be grown. In general, it may be said that relatively to tillage and cattle raising, sheep farming was becoming less profitable, and that most of the enclosures were for the purpose of convertible husbandry.

Discovery and Exploration. — The notable exploits of Elizabethan seamen have influenced profoundly the history of England and the history of the world in a multitude of ways. In these men the spirit of the Renascence was wonderfully manifested, and geographical knowledge, literature, religion, commerce, industry, colonization, and the spread of civilization all bear the marks of their achievements. They circumnavigated the globe; they opened Russia and the East to English trade, they extended English commerce into the Mediterranean and along the African coast; they took the first steps toward securing a foothold in India; they undertook Arctic voyages in search of northeast and northwest passages to Cathay; and they made possible the beginnings of English colonization in America.

The Opening up of Russia and Central Asia. — The opening up of Russia began with an attempt on the part of two daring explorers, Richard Chancellor and Sir Hugh Willoughby, in search of the northeast passage. Of the three ships which began the voyage, in 1553, two, including Willoughby's, were lost. Chancellor, "very heavy, pensive, and sorrowful," proceeded alone. He rounded the North Cape, passed southward to the White Sea, and landed near the present Archangel. Thence he journeyed fifteen hundred miles on sledges to Moscow, the court of Ivan the Terrible, King of the Muscovites. After remaining three months he returned to England with letters from Ivan and an account of the condition and resources of his Kingdom. Chancellor was drowned on his return from a subsequent voyage, but the Muscovite ambassador who accompanied him was

[1] Due to the development of mixed farming or convertible husbandry when lands used for tillage one year were turned into pasture the next, and *vice versa*.

received at Mary's court in 1557. Having secured a foothold in Russia and the favor of the Tsar, English enterprise was extended under Elizabeth, by journeys along the shores of the Caspian Sea into Turkestan and northern Persia, valuable commercial privileges being secured in all these countries. However, the death of Ivan, in 1584, marked the decline of English trade in this direction, the Dutch broke in upon the monopoly, and new fields of commerce and other routes to the further east were sought.

The Mediterranean. The Overland and Sea Routes to India. — One was overland from the Mediterranean, a natural development from the Turkey trade which was being pushed forward vigorously. Most notable of all was an overland expedition led by John Newberrie and Ralph Fitch. Starting from Syria, in 1583, they went in company as far as the western coast of India. There Fitch parted pany with Newberrie, and penetrated to Bengal and other parts of the eastern side of the peninsula, probably the first Englishman who ever made the journey. The other route was by sea around southern Africa. James Lancaster and George Raymond, the first Englishmen to venture past the Cape of Good Hope,[1] returned in 1594, having gone as far as Malacca and Ceylon. The tales of these explorers and the desire to compete with the Dutch,[2] who were beginning to supplant the Portuguese in the East Indies, led to the formation of the English East India company, in 1599.

The English Seamen in the Western World. — Biggest, however, in results, as we view them, were the voyages to our American shores and the first steps toward colonization within the limits of the present United States. The Cabots had prepared the way in the reign of Henry VII, but little more was done till Elizabeth's time, when Hawkins and Drake stirred the spirit of English maritime adventure, the crowning achievement being Drake's circumnavigation of " the whole globe of the earth " from 1577 to 1580. There was still much speculation as to the possibility of a northwest passage, and Englishmen hoped to discover gold as well as a trade route in the bleak northern regions. Thither, Martin Frobisher made three voyages (1576–1578) adding much to the knowledge of Greenland and Labrador.

Early English Attempts at Colonization. — Attempts at conquest and settlement followed in the wake of these voyages of discovery

[1] The Portuguese, Bartholomew Diaz, was the first to round the Cape of Good Hope, in 1486. In 1497–1498 Vasco de Gama made his celebrated voyage from Portugal to India.

[2] Their various trading companies were united into the Dutch East India Company, in 1602.

and plundering raids. The pioneer was Sir Humphrey Gilbert who, in 1578, received a patent for " the planting of our people in America." Failing in his first two voyages, he sailed again, in 1583, and reached the coast of Newfoundland, where he founded the first colony in British North America. On his return voyage he went down with his ship, crying with pious courage to those in a neighboring vessel: " We are as near heaven by sea as by land." His half-brother, Sir Walter Raleigh, took over his patent, and the region which he selected for colonization was named " Virginia," after England's virgin Queen. Although the various colonies which he sent failed to establish a permanent settlement on the Carolina coast, he deserves credit for his efforts in a work so big in future results. Never setting foot himself on the shores of North America, he did, however, make a voyage, 1595, in search for El Dorado, the fabulous city — an expedition that gave the English their claim to the present British Guiana. Also, Elizabethan seamen undertook numberless other journeys to remote lands and distant seas, and the whole wonderful story may be read in the stirring pages of the contemporary Richard Hakluyt (1552–1616) whose *Principal Navigations, Voyages, and Discoveries of the English Nation* — form the " best collection of the exploits of the heroes in whom the new era was revealed."

Foreign Trade. — Governmental regulation of trade still prevailed. New navigation laws were passed, partly for protection and partly to foster English seamenship. The latter motive also played a part in the encouragement of the fisheries, which explains why England, a Protestant country, not only enforced fast-days by law, but added Wednesday as a new " fish day." In order to nurse infant industries the importation of certain manufactured goods and the export of raw materials (except wool which was an English staple) were discouraged. One curious enactment provided that, on Sundays and holidays, every English subject over six years of age must wear a cap of native manufacture or pay a fine.[1] Monopolies were another means of fostering English industry and commerce, though, later in the reign, they were also employed as a means of adding to the royal revenues. All sorts of luxuries and some necessities were imported. Trade was largely monopolized by great merchant companies. The old Merchant Adventurers, who had received a patent from Henry VII, were incorporated with extended privileges in 1564, while most noteworthy among the many new companies was the famous East India Company, which laid the foundations of the present Indian Empire of Great

[1] The "woolsack", on which the Chancellor sits in the House of Lords, had its origin in the same effort to foster the national industry.

Britain. Though the Dutch still led in almost all branches of commerce and though agriculture still remained England's chief industry, this period is marked by progress in manufactures and trade which led within two centuries to her preëminence over all rivals.

Burghley's Economic Policy. — This great development was due, in a considerable degree, to Burghley. With him the strength of the State was the main aim, and much of his industrial and commercial legislation was designed toward that end. He developed mining and manufacturing with a view of enabling England to supply her own ordnance and ammunition, and, in order to increase the effectiveness of the navy, he took steps to preserve the timber lands, to increase the native supply of hemp and sailcloth, and actively encouraged the merchant marine. Among the means which he employed were: the formation of trading companies, granting patents of monopoly, fostering the fisheries, and improving the harbors. In some respects his policy was sharply opposed to that of Elizabeth: he was against piracy, which she secretly encouraged, and he disapproved of the navigation laws on the ground that, while they helped the growth of English shipping, they encouraged the importation of luxuries, such as wines, silks, and spices.

Internal Trade and Industry. — Industry was greatly stimulated by immigrants from France and Flanders, who went, in limited numbers, to towns authorized by license to receive them, introducing, among other things, thread and lace making and silk weaving. The gilds which had long regulated industry, at first independently and then under central control, were already on the decline before the Reformation, and the confiscation of their religious and charitable funds under Henry VIII and Edward VI practically forced them to the wall. In many places "livery companies" were formed to take their place, new organizations,[1] which were associations of employers authorized by the Crown instead of the municipalities, and often included several trades. Their aim was to supervise the quality of wares, to keep records of entered apprentices, and to protect the natives of corporate towns in competition with aliens. In order better to control conditions of labor and production, Elizabeth, in the fifth year of her reign, passed the famous Statute of Apprentices, not repealed till 1813. All able-bodied men, with certain exceptions noted in the Act, were liable to serve as agricultural laborers; measures were framed to prevent irregular and brief employment, vagrancy, migration of laborers and artificers alike; and the term of apprenticeship was fixed at seven years in both town and country. In the choice of apprentices the

[1] Not to be confused with the merchant companies who traded abroad.

rural districts and the corporate towns were given special advantages over market towns, which checked the drift toward the newer towns where conditions of employment had been unregulated and lax. Also the Act intrusted the assessment of wages to the justices of the peace acting under the supervision of the Council, and wages were no longer arbitrarily fixed as had been the case under the old Statutes of Laborers, but were to be regulated according to plenty or scarcity and according to local conditions.

The Poor Laws. — Important as were the poor laws of Henry VIII in foreshadowing new principles, he failed to provide effective means for enforcing them. While something was done to improve his system under both Edward and Mary, it remained for the government of Elizabeth to put the laws in a shape which survived, in most of their features, down to the nineteenth century. The famous "Old Poor Law" of 1601 was really only the embodiment in permanent form of a series of statutes extending from 1563 to 1598. In substance it provided that: contributions for the relief of the poor should be compulsory; habitations were to be furnished for the impotent and aged; children of paupers were to be apprenticed; stocks of hemp and wool were to be provided for the employment of sturdy idlers; and houses of correction were to be set up for those who obstinately refused to work.

Royal Progresses. — The Queen in her tireless pursuit of pleasure and her fondness for magnificent display[1] naturally set the fashion for her people, particularly the Court and the upper classes. This ostentation was peculiarly manifest in the royal progresses, when she was entertained so lavishly as to bring many noblemen and gentlemen to the verge of ruin. These journeys and visits served various purposes: they gratified the Queen's inordinate vanity; they were a part of her economy, for during long intervals she was supported at the expense of others; and finally they kept her before her subjects and stimulated rivalry in loyalty. The most famous of the entertainments in her honor was that provided by Leicester at Kenilworth Castle, where she stayed three weeks in the summer of 1575. There were all sorts of pageantry and poetry, giants, nymphs, fireworks, a floating island in a pool in front of the palace, hunting, tilting, bear baiting, tumbling, rustic sports, songs, and masques.

Dress and Manner of Living. — Extravagance and artificiality were characteristic of the dress, the manners, and the speech of the period. Women dressed their hair in most elaborate fashions; they surrounded their necks with enormous ruffs held by wire or starch

[1] In spite of her parsimony she left a wardrobe of 3000 gowns.

and wore huge farthingales or hoop skirts. And the men were fully as bad. They perfumed themselves with musk and civet; and with tight-fitting nether stocks and trunk hose, surmounted by padded doublets or jackets, with highly ornamented cloaks slung over their shoulders, with gaudy befeathered hats, and girt with swords and adorned with bracelets and earrings, they presented an imposing show. The dress of the laborer was of necessity very plain; but sumptuary laws were passed from time to time to check the extravagance of the lower classes and to encourage the use of homemade woolens. There were abundant sports and diversions in town and country. The man of fashion lounged in the nave of St. Paul's of a morning; he dined at a tavern, drinking heavily and smoking tobacco, a practice introduced from the New World before the close of the reign; then he might choose between bull and bear baitings and the theater for further amusements. Masques and interludes were frequent, and, for the hardier sort, tennis, football, wrestling, fencing, tilting, hunting, and hawking. There were still numerous holidays, each with its appropriate festival, with mummings, games, and abundant eating and drinking. The merits of soap were not yet fully recognized, though refinements and luxuries were on the increase, such as chimneys, glass windows and carpets in place of lattice and rushes. Plate and glassware were abundant among the wealthy, while the poor used pewter. Knives supplanted the fingers in eating, more and more, and forks were soon to appear. Many artificers and farmers even began to have beds hung with tapestry and to discard logs of wood and sacks of chaff for pillows. Timber houses gave way to dwellings of brick and stone. There was great lament over these changes: it was said that when houses were of willow there were men of oak, and that now with houses of oak there were men of straw.

Architecture. — By Elizabeth's time men had ceased to use the Gothic style in building. The classical Italian, which gradually replaced it, was at first a mixture of Italian and Gothic, and was chiefly employed in secular building; for, from the Reformation to well into the seventeenth century, church building of original artistic value practically ceased. Henry VIII was as fond of fine buildings as he was of fine clothes, though Wolsey, who built Hampton Court and Christ Church, Oxford, was far more active in construction, while Henry's courtiers were too poor to build very extensively. It was only with the increase of wealth and the rising of standards of comfort of Elizabeth's time that such magnificent palaces as Kenilworth begin to raise their heads. Then, too, numbers of stately and artistic country mansions were erected. In the early part of her

reign the old English, rambling and picturesque in effect, still predominated over the Italian; later the Italian elements with greater symmetry of plan had come to prevail.

Prevalence of Superstition. — Except for William Gilbert's treatise on the magnet, in 1600, there were few real steps in advance between the Reformation and time of the Stuarts. Witchcraft and sorcery still held sway over men's minds. Alchemists and quacks had great vogue; indeed, a Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity resigned his chair to devote himself to the study of transmutation of metals. The revival of Greek medical science contributed to prolong a popular belief in astrology, while the triumph of the Copernican system was undermining its basic principles. One famous physician, who was a professor of the art, found it wise to flee the country after he had predicted from the stars a long life for Edward VI.

The Elizabethan Age an Epoch in the World's Literature. — The three main achievements of the Elizabethan age were: the establishment of Protestantism; the remarkable impulse in maritime enterprise; and the wonderful literary outburst, perhaps unparalleled in the world's history. The third remains to be considered. Up to this time England had produced only one writer of enduring fame — the incomparable Chaucer. While from the beginning of Elizabeth's reign promising writers were in evidence, the work of the decade preceding its close has never been matched in any period or country. In seeking to account for the phenomenon it is hardly enough to say that it was due simply to the fact that a number of men of unusual gifts of expression chanced to be born about the same time. Many causes had combined to awaken a spirit which quickened their imagination and stirred them to speech. First, there was the influence of the Italian Renascence. Those who first drank from that invigorating source were primarily interested in religious problems, and the ecclesiastical upheaval, which followed, diverted men for a time from pure literature. However, before the end of the reign of Henry VIII, Wyatt and Surrey had begun to voice the worldly aspect of Humanism, which was to reach such a choice and varied expression under Elizabeth. Secondly, the discoveries and explorations and the strange new outlook on the world which it brought, broadened the mental horizon of Englishmen and gave them stimulating food for thought. And, finally, the triumph over Catholicism and Spain aroused a national consciousness and a pride which clamored for utterance.

Translations. — The works of the ancients and of the Italians of the Renascence were opened to Englishmen largely through adapta-

tion and translations. The old printer Caxton had led the way. From his time until Elizabeth the most notable production of this sort was Surrey's *Æneid*. Then they followed thick and fast. In 1566 appeared William Painter's *Palace of Pleasure*, a collection of stories from the Greek, Latin, Italian, and French, which furnished a rich store of material for the Elizabethan dramatists. Another source from which they drew freely was Plutarch's *Lives*, done into English by Thomas North in 1579. Most of the earlier work of this field was by lesser men; but later such renderings as Chapman's *Iliad* (1598) and Florio's *Montaigne* (1603), deservedly rank as works of art.

Prose Literature: Early Affectation. "Euphuism." — Immaturity, the use of these foreign models, and the prevailing affectation led to much pedantry, extravagance, and obscurity among the earlier writers of the reign. There were a few stout protests against such "inkhorn English," larded with French or "Italianated" idioms. For example, Roger Ascham, himself a master of vigorous, plain but graceful English, declared that, "he that will write well in any tongue must speak as the common people do, and think as wise men do," and lamented that "many English writers have not done so, but, using strange words, as Latin, French, and Italian, do make all things dark." But the young writers of the new age were too impetuous and too bubbling over with ardor to take him as a model, nor did the impressive and grave simplicity of the Book of Common Prayer and the Bible translations of the previous generation appeal to them. It was only after a period of luxuriant extravagance that the ripe, finished, and gorgeous but dignified style of the late Elizabethan and early Jacobean era was attained. The summit of affectation was manifested in John Lyly's *Euphues*, 1579, a fantastic romance full of labored and far-fetched figures of speech. Taken up by the Queen, the work was enthusiastically received at Court, where a new style of speaking, known as "Euphuism," came into vogue. An inevitable reaction followed, and it was attacked and caricatured, notably by Shakespeare in his earliest play, *Love's Labour's Lost*. While the ridicule was deserved, *Euphues* accomplished something for the improvement of morals and culture, and the refinement of current speech.

The Middle Period. Sir Philip Sidney. — Sir Philip Sidney (1554–1586), whose short life was crowded with activity as a soldier, statesman, and poet, marks the transition from the earlier to the later period. Although an outspoken critic of Lyly, *Arcadia*, his first book, is marked to a considerable degree by the same faults of

artificiality and diffuseness. On the other hand, it is illuminated by passages of real beauty and was immensely popular for nearly two centuries, until the advent of the modern novel, for which it was a forerunner, superseded the type. His *Apologie for Poetrie*,[1] 1581, one of the earliest pieces of English criticism and a splendid vindication of imaginative literature, though not free from exuberance, pedantry, and scholasticism, marks a great advance over the *Arcadia*. One passage will illustrate the wondrous charm of his phrasing at its best. "Nature," he says, "never set forth the earth in so rich tapestry as divers poets have done, neither with so pleasant rivers, fruitful trees, sweet smelling flowers, nor whatsoever else may make the too much loved earth more lovely." Altogether, Sidney marks a genuine advance in clearness, genuineness of feeling, and beauty of expression.

The Crowning Decade. — As was the case with all other forms of Elizabethan literature, the truly great prose did not appear until the last decade of the reign. Richard Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*, the first four books of which appeared in 1594, did much to soften the strife between Puritan and Anglican. With "sweet reasonableness" the "judicious Hooker" sought to justify the Church of England by a threefold appeal: to Scripture and primitive practice; to reason; and to the needs of the times, arguing that its policy best accorded with all three. Aside from its polemical importance it is a recognized monument of classic English prose. Equally significant in form, and even more in substance, because of their more general appeal, are the *Essays*, 1597, of Francis Bacon (1561–1626) whom many regard as England's greatest intellectual product. Though he esteemed Latin to be the only tongue fit for learned communication, and wrote in English only under protest, his style, in spite of its formality and overgreat use of Latinized expressions, is remarkable for its vigor, wit, incisiveness, and pith. The only parts which he ever completed of a vast treatise designed to comprehend all learning and science, appeared in the next reign. Of the men who supported themselves by their pens, most wrote chiefly for the theater; yet, altogether, they produced a large body of miscellaneous writing — prose fiction and controversial pamphlets. Perhaps the most worthy of note are Robert Greene's *Repentance* and *A Groat's Worth of Wit* which tell of his own irregular life, all too characteristic of the set in which he moved, and Thomas Lodge's *Rosalynde*, a romance regarded as the most perfect bit of prose fiction of the time, from which Shakespeare got the plot of *As You Like It*. Thomas Nash, who died in poverty at an early age, also wrote vigorous biting prose, and entered into all

[1] Or *Defense of Poesie*.

sorts of controversies, attacking with especial bitterness the Puritan authors of the Marprelate Libels, while his *Unfortunate Traveller*, or the *Adventures of Jack Wilton*, a romance of reckless exploits, is an interesting anticipation of one type of modern novel.

Elizabethan Historical Writing. — Throughout the reign men were producing important historical works. John Fox (1516–1587), one of the Marian exiles, published, in 1563, the first English edition of his famous *Acts and Monuments*, popularly known as the "Book of Martyrs." In 1578 appeared Holinshed's *Chronicles*, which furnished Shakespeare with the materials for his historical plays, and for some of his grandest tragedies. John Stow's *Survey of London*, 1598, is a mine of information on the buildings and streets of the Elizabethan city. Other historical works reflect the larger world that writers of the age were coming to know. In this field Richard Hakluyt's *Principall Navigations* outshines them all.

Poetry. — Yet it is in its poetry that the age is really distinctive. There was a constantly swelling stream of sonnets, lyrics, pastorals, epics, and, above all, of dramas, of unsurpassed richness, variety, and beauty. For twenty years, however, it was chiefly minor poets that were busy, and anthologies appeared with titles more enticing than their contents warranted; for example, *A Gorgeous Gallery of Gallant Inventions*, 1578. *The Shepherd's Calendar*, 1579, of Edmund Spenser (1552–1599) marks the transition between the period of beginnings and the glorious final decade of the reign. Meantime, Philip Sidney had begun his charming group of sonnets entitled *Astrophel and Stella*,[1] noteworthy not only for their own sake, but for their influence on Shakespeare's matchless collection. Only a work especially devoted to literary history could give an adequate description of the mass of exquisite songs and lyrics which appeared thenceforth either independently, or, set like jewels, in the contemporary stories and plays. The "great epic of Elizabethan England" was Spenser's *Faerie Queene*, 1590–1596. Cast in the form of a medieval romance, it is in substance an allegorical manifestation of the spirit of the age — a defense of Protestantism, and a glorification of Elizabeth as the champion of the truth and virtue against Papal Rome, embodiment of error and vice.

The Drama. English and Roman Sources. — Rich and beautiful as was the Elizabethan literature in its manifold forms, the supreme achievement was in the drama. While distinctly an expression of the spirit of the age, inspired and strongly influenced by the study

[1] They were written during the years from 1575–1583, though they were not published till 1591.

of revived classical and Italian models, it was not wholly unaffected by the popular and Court festivals and the religious representations which had been developing for centuries on the native soil. The pageants and masques, the mysteries, miracle and morality plays, the interludes and mummings which delighted the medieval Englishmen furnished one fruitful source. From them came the local color, the life and the old time jollity. The other source is to be found in the Roman dramas, revived in the Italy of the Renascence. They served as models of style and structure and provided many of the plots.[1] Masters of the great public schools prepared scenes from the Roman comedy writers, chiefly Plautus and Terence, for their boys to act, either in Latin or in English translation. Nicholas Udall marked an epoch when, about 1541, he wrote in English, from a Latin model, *Ralph Roister Doister*, the first English comedy. In tragedy the chief model was Seneca. The first English tragedy in the approved classical style was *Gorboduc* or *Ferrex and Porrex*, based on an old British legend from Geoffrey of Monmouth. Written by Thomas Norton and Thomas Sackville, Lord Buckhurst, it was presented before Queen Elizabeth, in 1561. In general, however, the first half of Elizabeth's reign was not productive of significant dramatic works, and while plays of all sorts were written, it was largely a time of experiment.

The "University Group." — The "great dramatic period" opened first with the so-called "University Group." The list includes many names. George Peele, an Oxford man who wrote plays, pageants, and miscellaneous verse, was brilliant and versatile but weak in power of construction, as is evident in his *David and Bethsabe*, full of fine, detached passages. Preëminent among the Cambridge group was Christopher Marlowe, the author of many remarkable plays — *Tamburlaine* (about 1587); *The Tragedy of Dr. Faustus* (1588); and *The Jew of Malta* (1593). Also he wrote a goodly part of the second and third parts of *Henry VI*, which Shakespeare revised and completed. Much other work, too, he produced before he was killed in a drunken brawl at the age of twenty-nine. His *Tamburlaine* marked an epoch in tragedy, while his sonorous, uneven blank verse far excelled that of any who had preceded him. With an amazing mingling of bombast and sublimity he set forth the soaring flights of human ambition, for power in *Tamburlaine*, for knowledge in *Dr. Faustus*, for wealth in the *Jew of Malta*. In spite of his lack of humor and restraint, some leading critics have ranked him among the world's

[1] While the scenes of the Elizabethan writers were laid in far-off countries in bygone days their characters were English to the core.

great poets. Robert Greene went first to Cambridge and later to Oxford. Although his prose, and the poetry scattered through it, are superior to any of his dramas, one of the latter, *The Honorable Historie of Frier Bacon and Frier Bungay*, contains glowing pictures of healthy country life. Altogether, the "University Group struck out one of the faultiest, but one of the most original and vigorous kinds of literature that the world has seen." While it is full of extravagance and horror, it is charged with passion and power. If many of the plots are ill constructed and told in language often overwrought, frequent passages of lofty eloquence and rare sweetness more than make atonement. The lives of most of this set were as tempestuous as their works, and, with one or two exceptions, they came to a sad and untimely end.

William Shakespeare (1564–1616). — The English drama reached its culmination in Shakespeare, who, indeed, has been without a peer before or since in any language. Something, but not overmuch, is known about him, nor is it strange that so few details of his life have survived, for he came of a family of no distinction, he did not go to a university, he did not belong to a learned profession, and nothing that he wrote, save a few poems, was published with his authority in his lifetime. For twenty years, from about 1591, when he wrote *Love's Labour's Lost*, until 1611, when he completed *The Tempest*, he was actively writing. During this time he produced about forty plays, besides the sonnets and the poems, *Venus and Adonis*, and *Lucrece*. The plays include all sorts: history, comedy, tragedy, dramatic romance, and melodrama. He portrays every mood from mirth and joy to black despair, and every class of society from peasant to king; he deals with every phase of human passion: love, jealousy, ambition, and resignation, besides telling the past life of his people and reflecting to posterity the conditions of his own age. Though while he lived, his works appeared only in pirated editions, and are not mentioned in his will, they were collected in a folio edition, in 1623, and thus have come down to us.

The Shakespearian Theater. — The means for presenting the wonderful dramas of that age were curiously primitive. The early mystery or miracle plays had been given in churches and churchyards, then on moving carts or pageants. Others were rendered in noblemen's halls or in the courtyards of inns, the audience looking down from surrounding galleries; still others were produced privately at court. By the middle of Elizabeth's reign independent theaters had begun to spring up. Originally they were placed in the suburbs, since, for reasons of public policy, the authorities refused to have

them in London; within a few years, however, the actors pushed into the City, and, before the close of the century, there were eleven playhouses in London and the adjoining districts. They were very simple structures, circular or octagonal in shape, with the center or pit where the poorer classes stood, open to the sky, which afforded the only light.[1] The surrounding galleries only were roofed; here or on the stage the fashionable classes sat, lounging, eating, smoking, talking, flirting, and interrupting the actors when it pleased them. Female parts were played by young men. While costumes were often rich, scenery and properties were most primitive: a change of scene was indicated by a placard; a lantern represented the moon; a wooden cannon and a pasteboard tower a siege. Yet the absence of elaborate scenery had its advantages; it fixed attention on the play and it called forth some of Shakespeare's finest descriptive passages.

The Successors of Shakespeare. — While no one reached the height of Shakespeare, the great age of Elizabethan drama continued under the Stuarts, until an ordinance of 1642 closed the theaters for some years. Foremost among the younger contemporaries and successors of Shakespeare was Ben Jonson (1573–1637), poet laureate of James I, literary dictator of the time and king of tavern wits. Learned, rugged, and fearless, he struggled for pure classicism against the prevailing romantic tendencies, drew lifelike pictures of his age, and strove for workmanlike restraint, though he could fashion sweet, beautiful lyrics. It would take pages merely to enumerate the names and plays of hosts of others. In spite of their achievements the drama steadily declined. The youthful ardor was gone, and the growing Puritan spirit was hostile. By way of reaction, playwrights catered more to the courtier and the cavalier with coarseness and sensational horror. Many fair pieces continued to be written, but the greatest literary work now came to be produced in other fields. "Merrie England," throbbing with fullness of life, was yielding to riotousness and dissipation at one extreme, at the other to soberer ideals and practice.

Final Estimate of the Elizabethan Period. — Altogether, Elizabeth's long reign, though blemished by traits of meanness, shuffling, and evasion, was a period of glorious achievement. Her Court was a center of pomp and magnificence, learning and statesmanship, where polished gentlemen, brilliant adventurers, wise councilors and judges strove with each other for her favor. If the peace, prosperity, and industrial development, the ecclesiastical settlement, and the

[1] Though plays were given in the afternoon it grows dark very early in London in the autumn and winter.

wonderful literary outburst were not all her work, they all redounded to her credit. For a time Elizabeth seemed the most absolute, the strongest, and the most popular of all the rulers of her House. But the splendor and strength of her power reached maturity during the years just following the Armada. As she approached the close of her reign, the luster of her glory had begun to dim and the vigor of her power to decline. Her people began to await impatiently for her decease to open the way for new men and new measures. Those who valued religious and political liberty more than wealth eagerly greeted the new dynasty from Scotland.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

Constitutional. Prothero, *Statutes*, introduction, an admirable survey. Sir Thomas Smith, *De Republica Anglorum, A Discourse on the Commonwealth of England* (first published in 1583; the best and most recent edition, 1906, ed. L. Alston). Also Taswell-Langmead; Taylor; and Hallam.

Social and Industrial. Innes, *England under the Tudors*, ch. XXVIII. Traill; Cunningham; Ashley; Rogers; Tickner and Usher. E. M. Leonard, *Early History of English Poor Relief* (1900). Hubert Hall, *Society in the Elizabethan Age* (1901). Stephenson, *The Elizabethan People* (1910). G. Unwin, *Industrial Organization in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (1904). Harrison's famous *Description of England*, from Holinshed's *Chronicle*, is reprinted in the "Camelot Series" (ed. L. Withington, n. d.). P. H. Ditchfield, *The England of Shakespeare* (1917). *Shakespeare's England* (2 vols., 1916), a coöperative work. Frank Aydelotte, *Elizabethan Rogues and Vagabonds* (1913).

Maritime enterprise, the Navy and the Army. Pollard, ch. XVI; Innes, ch. XXIII; Froude, *English Seamen in the Sixteenth Century* (1895); J. W. Williamson, *Maritime Enterprise, 1485–1588* (1913), based on documents. Selections from Hakluyt's *Voyages* ed. by E. J. Payne (2 series, 1893–1900) and C. R. Beazley (1907). Oppenheim, *Administration of the Royal Navy*, I; J. S. Corbett, *Drake and the Tudor Navy* (2 vols., 1898) and *The Successors of Drake* (1900). Fortescue, *British Army*, I.

Literature. Moody and Lovett; *Cambridge History of Literature;* Jusserand, II; and Taine, I, II. Saintsbury, *History of Elizabethan Literature* (1890). *Cambridge Modern History*, III; Pollard, ch. XXIII; Innes, ch. XXVII. Sidney Lee, *Life of Shakespeare* (1898), the standard biography. Sir Walter Raleigh, *William Shakespeare* (1907), a charming appreciation.

For the Church, see references to chs. XXIV and XXV, together with R. G. Usher, *The Reconstruction of the English Church* (2 vols., 1910).



CHAPTER XXVII

JAMES I AND THE BEGINNINGS OF THE PURITAN REVOLUTION (1603–1625)

The Significance of the Accession of James I. — The accession of the Stuarts in the person of James I, 24 March, 1603, was fraught with consequences. United and prosperous, the mass of the English people were now eager to throw off the Tudor absolutism, which had fulfilled its mission, and to ask for more liberty. There was much in the old system which they opposed, and which not only stood in the way of free religious and political development, but might, under a new line of Sovereigns, menace the little which they still enjoyed. There was the State Church absolutely under royal control; there were the extraordinary courts, all independent of common law guarantees; and there were taxes and exactions, not only oppressive in themselves, but peculiarly dangerous from the fact that they made the Sovereign independent of Parliament. These were the special grievances, actual or potential. The main issue which was tried out under the Stuarts was whether the sovereignty, supposed to rest in the King-in-Parliament, should, in cases of conflict, be exercised by the Monarch or by the body which stood between him and the people. The result was victory for Parliament. In this respect England led, by nearly two centuries, the countries of Continental Europe, where the tendency, during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, was toward increasing absolutism, and the tide did not turn till the French Revolution.

The King's Early Scotch Environment. — James, called upon to face a situation grave enough for any one, "turned out to be one of those curiosities which the laws of inheritance occasionally bring to the notice of mankind." Not only did he represent an alien house to whom the English were bound by no ties of gratitude, but he was totally unfitted by training and temperament to rule a country where the ideal was constitutional government. When, as an infant scarcely more than a year old, James VI had succeeded to the throne of Scot-

land, 24 July, 1567, another minority was added to those which had during two centuries plagued the country. Internal and border wars had torn the Kingdom for ages: the barons contended against the Crown; Highland chiefs fought against Lowland lords and each fought among themselves, while the Border was wasted by the constant passage of Southron and Scot, and the wild Highlander lived by pillage. Parliament was not a representative body but a collection of factions from the various estates; the King rarely went to it for supplies and the nobles redressed their own grievances.

The religious grievances added another element of discord. While the Reformation was aimed against real abuses in the ancient Church, it was directed by greedy nobles who appropriated the greater part of its temporal goods. The General Assembly of the new Church not only demanded a more adequate share of the ecclesiastical property but the right to interfere in State affairs. Finally, the intrigues of the French and Romanists, and of Elizabeth's agents as well, all contributed still further to weaken national sentiment and to promote lawlessness. Truly, the little James grew up in troublous times. Before he was fifteen years old, four Regents had come and gone, of whom only one died a natural death. Twice the King himself had been taken captive by factious nobles. Weak in position and in temperament, he sought to make himself strong and to attain the English succession by the only means open to him, by dissimulation and intrigue, a policy upon which he came to pride himself and which he dignified by the name of "Kingcraft." So he had grown up to thread a tortuous way between a rapacious, turbulent nobility and a gloomy, fanatical, domineering clergy, between an English and a French party; between, indeed, all sorts of conflicting forces.

Character of the King. — There were many good points about James. He had the good of his subjects at heart, he strove for peace, and aimed to be the reconciler of factions and the arbiter of warring nations. He had a touch of Scotch shrewdness, he was kind-hearted, and on the whole good-natured. Gifted with considerable natural ability, he had been carefully educated, but he was uncouth in manners and was a pedant rather than a scholar; he paraded rather than applied his learning, so that he was properly called "the wisest fool in Christendom." Naturally indolent, he was also timid and infirm of purpose, impatient of detail, and irritated at contradiction. From his youth up he was easily led by favorites, who gained ascendancy over him more by their personal graces than by their attainments. James' Queen, Anne of Denmark († 1619) was not a help to him. Although faithful, kindly, and personally popular, she was frivolous

and extravagant; moreover, she inclined toward Rome and was reported to be a convert, although she finally died a Protestant.

James and "The Divine Right of Kings." — A most fruitful source of discord between James and his subjects was the exalted notions which he held concerning the origin and nature of Monarchy. Already before coming to England he had shaped his views, and, in the *True Law of Free Monarchies*, had asserted that a Monarch was created by God and accountable to God alone, though he graciously admitted that a good King should govern in the popular interest. Such views in themselves were enough to arouse the bitterest opposition. James only added fuel to the fire by his astounding manner of stating them. "The State of Monarchy," he announced in a speech before Parliament, in 1610, "is the supremest thing upon earth; for Kings are not only God's lieutenants upon earth and sit upon God's throne, but even by God himself they are called gods . . . . That as to dispute what God may do is blasphemy . . . so it is seditious in subjects to dispute what a King may do in the height of his power."

James I and the Puritans. The Millenary Petition (1603). — Counting much on the fact that he had been brought up a Protestant, the Puritan[1] clergy presented to James as he journeyed to London, in April, 1603, the so-called Millenary Petition,[2] embodying various demands: I, that the ritual of the Church be purged of Romish forms and ceremonies, such as the cross in baptism, and the wearing of the cap and surplice, that holidays be decreased, and the Sabbath be better observed; II, that more care be taken to secure learned preachers; III, that such abuses as non-residence and pluralities[3] be abolished; IV, that oppressive customs in the ecclesiastical courts be remedied — their expensive procedure, their excommunication for trivial matters, and their use of the *ex officio* oath.

The Hampton Court Conference (1604). — In January, 1604, James arranged a conference between representatives of their party on the one hand, and certain bishops and clergy of the Established Church on the other. The King himself presided. Bred a Calvinist, he favored Calvinistic theology, he was fond of argument, tolerant of other men's opinions, and too kind-hearted to be a persecutor. At the same time, he had been overawed and browbeaten by Presbyterian ministers from his youth up, and his later experiences only accentuated his distrust of the Presbyterian theory that all men were

[1] Those who wanted to stay in the Church while purifying it of certain abuses.

[2] Because it was supposed to have been signed by 1000 clergymen. As a matter of fact, it was assented to by about 800.

[3] The holding of many Church offices in one hand.

equal in the sight of God, that the Church was independent of State control, and of their Presbyterian practice of interfering in secular affairs. In shining contrast, to his mind, was the English custom where the Sovereign appointed the bishops and through them controlled the Church. "No Bishop, no King" was his motto. He was on the lookout for any political bearing in the Puritan demands, and when their leader began to outline a scheme of government he burst out: "If you aim at Scotch presbytery, it agreeth as well with monarchy as God and the devil." After a long harangue he concluded with the ominous threat to the Puritans: "I will make them conform themselves, or else I will harry them out of the land, or else do worse." The only results of the Conference were a few alterations in the liturgy, and the decision to translate the Scriptures which bore fruit in the famous King James' version, 1611. Before the close of 1604 a proclamation was issued depriving of their livings those who refused to conform. Some of the irreconcilables went to the Low Countries, whence they migrated later and founded Plymouth Colony.

James and the Catholics. — The turn of the Catholics, who had hoped much from Mary's son, soon came. Averse to persecution and desirous of a Spanish alliance, he started by remitting the recusancy fines, and, in August, 1604, made peace with Spain, leaving the Dutch to shift for themselves, though he still allowed his subjects to volunteer in their service. Nevertheless, he could not accept the claim of Popes to be above earthly rulers and shuddered at the right which they asserted of deposing princes when the occasion demanded. Moreover, the Catholics multiplied so soon as they received the encouragement, James became agitated by accusations that he was leaning toward Rome, and resented the Pope's refusal to excommunicate certain turbulent members of his flock who were disturbing the repose of the Kingdom. As early as February, 1604, he issued a proclamation banishing priests; in June, Parliament passed an Act confirming and extending the penal laws of Elizabeth, and before the end of the summer the royal justices were busy enforcing them.

The Gunpowder Plot (1605). — The result was to precipitate a dangerous plot, already in the making, of which Robert Catesby, whose family had suffered for the old faith, was the leading spirit. Among the conspirators whom he enlisted was Guy Fawkes, a young Englishman who had been serving in the Spanish army in the Netherlands. After some delays and changes in their plan they at length hired a house with a cellar running under the Parliament buildings, where they deposited twenty barrels of gunpowder which they covered with iron bars, faggots, and billets of wood. Their design was to blow

up the Lords and Commons, together with James and his eldest son, Prince Henry, when the session opened, in November, 1605. Beyond this they contemplated a general rising of the Catholics in the west Midlands, and the setting up of a new government. Too many, however, were taken into the secret, the plot was disclosed, and Fawkes was surprised and seized in the cellar. Catesby, with a number of his fellow plotters who had escaped to the scene of the projected rising, were shot in an attempt to bring it about, while several others who were captured were tried and executed, together with Fawkes. Under the name of Guy Fawkes's Day 5 November came to be celebrated as the anniversary of the discovery of the Gunpowder Plot, with bonfires and fireworks, and remained a national holiday for over two centuries. By way of retaliation Parliament, in 1606, passed two Acts greatly increasing Roman Catholic disabilities and imposing a new oath of allegiance, expressly denying the papal power of deposition, on all recusants. Another Act followed, in 1610. These penalties, however, were not enforced, partly because the pacific King did not want to drive the Catholics to desperation, partly because he was frequently in negotiation with Spain. Their existence, however, was a constant grievance to the Catholic subjects, while the failure to enforce them was a source of resentment to the Protestants.

Initial Difficulties with Parliament. — Parliament, which met for its first session, 19 March, 1604, came into conflict with James from the very start. His opening speech, though reasonable and dignified in many respects, was marked by evidences of his characteristic vanity and grotesqueness. Before proceeding to other business, two important cases of privilege were settled. By Goodwin's case it was determined that the Commons should henceforth be the sole judge of election returns of their members. In the case of Sir Thomas Shirley it was established that members, during the session and for an interval of forty days before and after, should be exempt from arrest for debt. Thus the King's power of excluding possible opponents from the House of Commons was greatly restricted. In sharp controversies which followed on various political and religious questions one fundamental issue was defined. The King took the ground that the Commons "derived all matters of privilege from him." In a notable Apology, which was drawn up and read in the House before the close of the session, they declared that their privileges of free election, freedom from arrest, and freedom of speech were their lawful inheritance and not a gift from the Sovereign — an inalienable right which could not be withdrawn. In this reply to the royal challenge

they took a position about which a fierce struggle was waged for nearly a century, a struggle from which Parliament ultimately emerged victorious.

James's Financial Embarrassments. — The King's chief weakness was his need of money, due partly to royal extravagance, though still more to the increasing needs of the State, and to the fact that the royal income had been fixed when money went further than it did at this time, when the standard of living was growing steadily higher and the influx of precious metals was still sending up prices. It speaks volumes that the thrifty Elizabeth had left a deficit. The plain duty of the Stuarts was to economize or, by timely concessions, to obtain larger grants from Parliament — that they did neither accounts for their final overthrow.

The Bate Case and Impositions (1606–1610). — One of the means by which James undertook to increase his revenue was the levying of impositions, and, in 1606, Bate, a Turkey merchant, refused to pay such an imposition on a consignment of currants. On the case being referred to the Court of Exchequer the barons decided in favor of the King. There was some legal ground for this decision; because, while it was recognized that direct taxes could not be imposed without parliamentary consent, there was no general prohibition comprehending all indirect taxes. Moreover, it had been customary for certain Sovereigns, particularly the Tudors, to impose such duties as a means of encouraging native industries or of striking a blow at the trade of hostile powers. Nevertheless, the power was fraught with dangerous consequences. Kings might employ it, not merely for the regulation of commerce, but in order to raise a revenue independent of Parliament. James's intentions were soon evident. In 1608 the Lord Treasurer issued a new Book of Rates, or tariff schedule, in which he greatly increased the revenue from tonnage and poundage, adding, at the same time, impositions to the amount of £70,000 a year. Nevertheless, there was still great need of money when Parliament assembled, 9 February, 1610.

The Great Contract (1610). — While the King was concerned chiefly with supply, the Commons were intent upon redress of grievances, financial, religious, and legal. After some haggling they agreed to grant a permanent revenue of £200,000 a year, provided that purveyance and feudal dues were given up. Then the matter was laid over till autumn. But when they met again the Commons insisted on including the redress of various other grievances. The King, on his part, felt that £200,000 was an inadequate compensation for what he was asked to yield. Thus the Great Contract, as it was called,

came to nothing. Worse than that, the bitterness engendered by the struggle marked another step in the breach between the Crown and Parliament.

Relations with Scotland to 1612. — Meantime, the Scotch question was producing friction that was to be a decisive factor in the coming conflict. James strove ardently to bring about a constitutional union between the two countries; but there were serious obstacles in the way. For one thing it would involve free trade, and the English were set against meeting the competition of the frugal and industrious Scot. Thus an irritating issue had been raised, destined to remain unsettled for a century. As the English opposed James's plan for a union, so the Scotch Presbyterians struggled against his restoration of the Episcopal system, which it took him from 1599 to 1612 to effect. Since he and the nobles selected bishops for the control of the Church, while the Presbyterian clergy represented the bulk of the people, anti-Episcopalianism came to be identified with national independence.

Irish Difficulties. The Plantation of Ulster (1611). — In spite of Lord Mountjoy's conquest, Ireland presented even greater difficulties than Scotland. Unable to maintain a standing army, England's only hope was in conciliation, though, in view of the turbulent and backward condition of the people, as well as the native hatred of the Church of England, the prospect seemed well-nigh hopeless. Other stumblingblocks were the greed of unscrupulous officials, and the land question. The colonists of Mary and Elizabeth were in general a thrifty and progressive class, but they were provided with estates which justly belonged to the Irish. James, however, sent out a wise and liberal-minded Lord Deputy, Sir Arthur Chichester, who with a free hand might have accomplished wonders. As it was, he put an end to martial law and pardoned offenses committed before the accession of James; also, he turned much of the tribal land which the chiefs had secured from Henry VIII into individual freeholds and transferred the tribal dependents into tenants with fixed obligations and rents protected by English law. But in religious affairs, bound unfortunately at the start by royal orders, he made futile attempts to enforce conformity, and when he afterward sought to strengthen the Church by regulating abuses and by putting in conscientious ministers it was too late. The situation became impossible. Persecution only nerved the priests to greater efforts, toleration multiplied their number and influence. Then an unsuccessful rising in the north led the Crown to seize vast estates, which were utilized for the celebrated Plantation of Ulster, in 1611. Against Chichester's advice the most fertile tracts were allotted to English and Scotch

settlers and undertakers.[1] As in the case of the previous plantations, the economic results were excellent, but, politically, new bitterness was engendered which bore fruit, thirty years later, in a bloody rebellion.

The "Addled Parliament" (1614). — After the failure of the Great Contract, the King got on for nearly four years without a Parliament, ever more and more hard put to it for money. After the death, in 1612, of the Lord Treasurer Salisbury he acted as his own chief Minister under the influence of frivolous, incompetent, and self-seeking favorites.

Early in 1614 James called his second Parliament;[2] but contrary to good advice, he decided to exclude impositions and all questions of an ecclesiastical nature from the grievances he was willing to redress. After two months spent in discussing the prohibited subjects Parliament was dissolved without having passed a single measure or voted a money grant; hence it was called the "Addled Parliament."

Grievances During the Inter-Parliamentary Period (1614–1620). (1) **Financial.** — Then followed another and longer interval of nearly seven years when James tried to get on without a Parliament, exciting opposition by the continuance of old grievances and by the addition of new ones. A leading cause of discontent lay in his futile schemes for raising money, though none of them proved specially burdensome. In 1614 letters from the Council were sent out asking for benevolences, but in three years they yielded only £66,000, less than a single subsidy, and called forth protests from some counties, refusals to pay from others. Another device, which happily attracted but few, was the sale of peerages and titles. Worse even than this, the nefarious practice of buying and selling offices, prohibited by a Statute of Edward VI, was vigorously pursued. Only the rich and the unscrupulous and mean-spirited, the one by purchase and the others by scheming and fawning, could hope to obtain places, and hence royal government became a chaos of intrigue.

(2) **Legal. The Crown and the Judges. Sir Edward Coke.** — More significant was a conflict which came to a head between the Crown and the judges. The King and his supporters maintained that there were occasions when reasons of State should prevail over strict legal rules, but in carrying out his policy he sought to set himself above the law and to make the judges mere creatures of the royal will. At the beginning of James's reign, before it was evident that their jurisdiction was to be infringed upon, the judges were, as the Bate

[1] Speculators or promoters.

[2] The first had held five sessions from 1604 to 1611.

case indicated, inclined to support the Crown, largely owing to their love of precedent and their failure to take into account the political bearings of an issue. Their attitude changed when attempts were made to encroach upon their Common Law jurisdiction. In the struggle which followed Sir Edward Coke (1552–1634) took the lead. He was harsh, avaricious, and narrow. As Attorney-General, 1594–1606, he had shown himself one of the most brutal prosecutors who ever served the Stuarts, and first began to oppose the King after he became Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, in 1606. Though his motives were largely personal and professional, his prodigious learning and his savage aggressiveness made him an invaluable champion of the popular cause. The struggle opened over prohibitions, or the right of the Common Law courts to restrain the ecclesiastical tribunals from proceeding with a case until the judges decided whether it lay within their field. Finally they had to yield on prohibitions; but, in 1610, they managed to carry another point, that the King could create no new offenses by proclamation. Another clash came, in 1614, over the case of Peacham, a clergyman, who, charged with writing against the King and Government, was convicted and died in prison. Before the trial the King called in the judges for consultation, a proceeding against which Coke stoutly protested, though on the narrow technical ground that James was acting contrary to custom, rather than on the broad principle that the Crown was seizing a dangerous weapon for prejudicing or intimidating the bench. In a suit which arose two years later, 1616, Coke was the only one who held out, refusing to promise anything further than that, when a case came before him, he would act as became a judge. He was suspended, and, ignoring a royal hint to cull from his Reports observations reflecting on the prerogative, was dismissed from his judgeship. In the next Parliament he appeared in the opposition ranks where he rendered valiant service. Coke and the judges, so far as they followed him, performed a great work in striving to hold the King to the limitations of the law; but it was well that they did not realize their ambition to act as arbiters in the great political questions at issue between the Sovereign and his people, for that would have resulted in the legal domination fully as dangerous to liberty and progress as royal tyranny.

(3) **Immorality at Court. The Rise of Villiers.** — A third cause of friction was in the frivolity, extravagance, and riotous life at Court which shocked the growing Puritan sentiment. James himself loved study, his life was pure, and he was never overcome by liquor. Nevertheless, he enjoyed the society of boon companions, he mingled with those of evil lives, and did nothing to reform his Court. Most scan-

dalous of all was the case of an unworthy favorite who rose to be Earl of Somerset. Convicted of complicity in a murder on evidence by no means conclusive, James commuted the death sentence to imprisonment in the Tower. Although he honestly labored to see justice done, the whole affair roused widespread and prolonged abhorrence. The growing arrogance of Somerset before his downfall had caused his personal and political enemies to bring to Court as a rival, George Villiers, the son of an obscure country knight but a youth of rare personal charm, clever, audacious, and ambitious. Villiers' influence proved more dangerous than that of Somerset because he came to play a greater rôle in public affairs.

(4) **Foreign Policy. The Spanish Marriage Negotiations (1604–1618).** — The relations with Spain marked another breach between James and his subjects and led to a series of parliamentary crises. The peace with Spain, in 1604, had been followed by negotiations for a marriage between Prince Henry and the eldest daughter of Philip III. James was particularly anxious to bring it about, as a means of cementing an alliance which he ardently desired: he wanted to prevent the recurrence of hostilities which had occupied so much of the previous reign, he admired the Spanish absolutism, and he aspired, with Spanish support, to become the peacemaker of Europe. Philip, however, demanded concessions in favor of Roman Catholics that James dared not grant. During the negotiations, which were more than once suspended, Prince Henry died and the eldest daughter of the Spanish King married Louis XIII of France, so her younger sister and Henry's brother Charles were substituted. The Spanish gradually became more anxious for the alliance, since a twelve years' truce with the Netherlands was due to expire in 1621 and England commanded the sea route to the Low Countries. Again, however, marriage negotiations were blocked, chiefly owing to the difficulty of relaxing the penal laws, and were only resumed after the English King had been drawn into the Thirty Years' War.[1]

The Beginning of the Thirty Years' War (1618–1620). — The war was brought on by difficulties growing out of the Reformation settlement, complicated by others of a political nature. The German princes were striving for independence against the Emperor, and in

[1] James's subserviency to Spain led to the sacrifice of Sir Walter Raleigh, who had been sentenced to death, in 1604, for an alleged plot against the Sovereign. Sorely in need of money, the English King had allowed him to go to South America in search of gold; at the same time promising the Spanish ambassador that if any Spanish possession were attacked, the leader would pay the penalty. A Spanish town in the Orinoco was destroyed. Raleigh on his return, June, 1618, was beheaded, though on the original charge.

Bohemia, where he was King, the national feeling was acute. In 1608 a Protestant Union was formed which called forth, in 1609, a Catholic League; but a series of events in Bohemia led to the first outbreak of the war. On the death of the childless Emperor Matthias, in 1619, the Bohemian Protestants, refusing to acknowledge as their King his cousin Ferdinand, a pupil of the Jesuits, whom he had selected for his successor,[1] chose the Count Palatine of the Rhine, Frederick V, son-in-law of James.[2] Ferdinand, who was elected Emperor, leagued with Maximilian of Bavaria and Philip III of Spain. A Spanish army invaded the Palatinate, while, 8 November, 1620, Frederick himself was decisively defeated at White Hill near Prague. He was driven out of Bohemia, his own Palatine lands were confiscated, and he fled to Holland. What began as a revolt in Bohemia became a general European conflict, drawing into its vortex England, Denmark, Sweden, and France, and directed against the ascendancy of the Spanish and Imperial branches of the House of Hapsburg and the triumph of the Counter-Reformation.

Divergent Views of James and the Popular Party regarding the Thirty Years' War. — James was finally moved to intervene, but solely in order to recover the Palatinate for his son-in-law, a purpose which he sought to effect by securing the good offices of Spain through the long-contemplated marriage alliance. Owing, however, to the need of money to carry on his diplomacy, he was obliged to call, in 1621, another Parliament, which precipitated another conflict with his subjects, for the majority regarded Spain as the prime mover in a great Catholic aggression which could best be met by a "war of diversion," that is, a naval war directed against the Spanish for the purpose of diverting them from the Imperial alliance. Feeling even that could wait they seized the opportunity to demand the redress of pressing grievances and the recognition of fundamental rights.

Monopolies and the Revival of Impeachments. — Among them were the non-enforcement of the recusancy laws and infringements on the liberty of speech, but they devoted their chief attention to abuses connected with monopolies. Even to-day monopolies are recognized by law in the case of patents and copyrights; at that time they went much farther and included the exclusive right of dealing in certain

[1] In theory the Emperor was elected. As a matter of fact, from 1438 till the dissolution of the Holy Roman or German Empire, in 1806, a member of the Austrian House of Hapsburg was always chosen. Since 1526 the kingdoms of Bohemia and Hungary had been annexed to the House of Austria in a personal union.

[2] The leading Calvinist Prince in Germany. He had married the Princess Elizabeth, in 1613.

commodities, of trading in a particular district, or of carrying on a specified industry. There were many reasons why this should have been so. The dangers from pirates and savages, the uncertainties of unknown lands and seas, the risk of shipwreck in small and weakly constructed ships made it necessary to offer unusual privileges in order to induce men to venture their lives and their capital. As a means of building up industries, monopolies were granted not only to inventors but to all who introduced new processes from abroad. Here again there was not infrequently a special justification, for example, in the case of arms and ammunition, to insure an adequate supply in the event of war. Licenses, too, were required from inns and alehouses, for the restriction and regulation of the traffic in drink. The chief complaint against James, who derived comparatively little revenue from his monopolies, was that he granted them to favorites who made a large profit from acting as figureheads in companies or from re-selling their rights. Moreover, those who had the supervision of inns and alehouses frequently used their powers for extortion and blackmail. As a result of the investigation which Parliament now undertook, the King abolished the worst abuses by proclamation, and, by an Act of 1624, monopolies with certain exceptions were done away with.[1]

Francis Bacon (1561–1626). — This first session of the Parliament of 1621 is also notable for the impeachment of Francis Bacon on charges of judicial corruption. Made Lord Chancellor, in 1618, and created Viscount St. Albans, in 1621, he had, in spite of his unusual abilities, risen very slowly. At once a man of affairs and a man of letters, he wrote on many subjects, philosophy, scientific theory, literature, history, and law. His views on politics were broad and liberal, he favored a strong monarchy resting on the support of the people and acting for the popular good, informed and advised by a loyal Parliament. Advocating liberal reforms in the law, he had, in the struggle with Coke, stood for interpreting legal questions on large grounds of policy rather than upon technical precedents. Always prone, however, to overlook practical difficulties, he failed to recognize that Parliament would no longer tolerate even a benevolent despot, and that, in any event, James was not the man to exercise such power. Yet, as he saw plan after plan fail, he continued in office as a supporter of the Crown. Aside from his vast intellect, his sobriety and industry, he had few commendable qualities; he was cold, lacking in affection, and fond of comfort and display; he stooped to the most servile

[1] These exceptions included: new inventions, charters to trading companies and certain specified manufactures.

flattery in his relations with James; he was ever ready with worldly-wise council; indeed, the poet Pope did not greatly exaggerate in designating him as the "wisest, wittiest, meanest of mankind."

His Impeachment and Fall (1621). — Parliament, already prejudiced against him, particularly since he had taken the royal side on the legality of monopolies, was very ready to listen to complaints brought against him by certain persons for accepting money from suitors while their cases were pending in Chancery, and, on the basis of these charges, proceeded to impeach him. Bacon, while he did not at first realize the gravity of the situation, was at length forced to admit, that while he had never allowed gifts to influence him, he had been guilty of accepting both presents and loans from those who had suits in his court. Public officials were in those days regularly in receipt of pay from companies and even from foreign countries in return for representing their special interests, and it was also customary for judges to accept gifts from successful suitors. Bacon, with a salary inadequate for his office, particularly in view of the pomp and circumstance of his household, also notoriously loose in money matters and contemptuous of forms, had simply neglected to wait until he rendered his decisions. The sentence imposed upon him was a heavy one; but more to mark Parliament's opinion of the enormity of the offense than with any thought that it would be fully executed. He was to pay a fine of £40,000, to be imprisoned in the Tower, to give up the Great Seal, and to be henceforth disqualified from holding any office of State or sitting in Parliament. The fine and imprisonment were remitted and the old man retired to achieve by his studies a reputation which he had failed to attain as an officer of State. His impeachment, while technical rules were not strictly observed, is an important step in the revival of a practice which had been in disuse for over a century and a half.

Second Session of the Parliament of 1621. — In the autumn session the difference over foreign policy developed into a momentous quarrel which reopened the whole question of privilege. James hoped, if the marriage between Prince Charles and the Infanta were brought about, that the Spanish would intervene to restore Frederick by force if necessary. The Commons, fearing that the Catholics were unduly encouraged, framed a petition asking that the Prince marry one of his own religion; calling for the execution of the penal laws; and for a war against Spain. A long and bitter correspondence resulted, in which the King forbade the Commons "to meddle with mysteries of State," asserting again that their privileges were derived from the grace of his ancestors, though he assured them that, so long as they

confined themselves within proper limits, "he would be careful to preserve their lawful liberties." More than one picturesque incident enlivened the controversy. When the Commons sent a deputation with a second petition, James cried "Bring stools for the ambassadors," implying that they were assuming the position of an independent power. Finally, they framed a protestation in which they declared that: "their liberties and privileges were the inherited birthright of the subjects of England; the State, the defense of the realm, the laws and grievances were proper matters for them to debate; the members have liberty of speech, and freedom from all imprisonment for speaking on matters touching Parliamentary business." The King adjourned the session, sent for the Journal, and tore out the protestation with his own hands, while opposition members were imprisoned or confined to their houses in London, and, 6 January, 1622, Parliament was dissolved.

The Journey of Charles and Buckingham to Spain (1623). — The Spanish, realizing that the King's hands were tied so long as he had failed to obtain supplies, determined to keep him at odds with his subjects in order to avoid the least chance of English intervention in the Continental war. To that end, their ambassador encouraged Charles and Buckingham [1] in a harebrained project — a journey incognito to Madrid, where the Prince was to woo the Infanta in person. The visit ultimately failed of its object, although Charles agreed to the hardest terms short of changing his religion. When it finally became clear that Spain would grant no aid in recovering the Palatinate negotiations were broken off. The initiative was taken by Buckingham, whose self-importance had been wounded by the lack of consideration shown him at the Spanish court, and to whom the popularity which would result from an anti-Spanish policy proved a temptation which he could not resist. Indeed, he made up his mind to go to the length of war and dragged Charles along with him.

The Parliament of 1624. Breach with Spain. — When Parliament met again, in 1624, James, who had hitherto refused to consider the right of the Commons to discuss foreign politics, now consented to ask their advice. Buckingham told all the assembled members the story of the journey to Spain, insisted that the Spanish had never intended to help recover the Palatinate, and urged that the marriage treaty be canceled. James had come to see that war was necessary; but he would only consent to a land war for the recovery of the Palatinate; Parliament was still bent on fighting Spain at sea, while Buckingham was keen for both. It was a part of his plan to ally with the

[1] The royal favorite Villiers, created Duke of Buckingham, 1623.

Dutch, the Danes, and the German princes, assisting them with English subsidies. In voting a grant, less than half the sum asked for, the Commons specified distinctly the purpose for which it was to be employed, which included the strengthening of the navy and assistance to the Dutch and other allies.

The French Marriage Treaty (1624). — Parliament was prorogued till autumn; but it never met again during the reign, for the King simply did not dare to face the Houses. On the failure of the Spanish marriage, negotiations had been opened with France for a marriage between Charles and Henrietta Maria, sister of Louis XIII. Although, during the recent session, James had distinctly promised that no concessions would be made to the recusants in consequence of any such alliance, Cardinal Richelieu, Louis's adroit and able chief Minister, forced the weak King and his weak son to agree to a secret article guaranteeing a relaxation of the penal laws, and on these terms the treaty was ratified, in December, 1624. However, France, though anxious to strike a blow at the Spanish and Austrian Hapsburgs, had no mind as yet to assist the German heretics. Accordingly, they refused to allow a rabble of raw pressed men whom James had dispatched abroad under a German soldier of fortune, Count Mansfeld, to pass through their territories. So in the dead of winter, he had to lead his half-clad troops into Holland, where more than three quarters of them perished of cold and starvation, and, in the spring, the miserable remnant returned to England.

Death of James and Estimate of His Reign. — In March, 1625, the poor old King, much reduced by gout and worry, was attacked by an ague, from which he died on the 27th. As a ruler he had been a failure. His problem in a critical time had been to economize and to gain the good will of his subjects. Yet he was lavish to the last, and, what with the expenses in connection with foreign affairs, he left the treasury too poor to give him a royal burial; he disappointed the Catholics and he disappointed the Puritans; he quarreled with the judges and he quarreled with Parliament. While he never acted without some color of legality, many of his measures ran counter to the temper of the times. By his pompousness and love of theorizing he alienated his subjects, and by his failure to meet crises with decision he forfeited their confidence. All through his reign he strove, in the teeth of Protestant prejudice and Elizabethan tradition, for an alliance with Spain, and lived to see his pet project destroyed by his son and his favorite. His only essay in war — the Mansfeld expedition — was a pitiful fiasco. The fresh memory of this, the empty treasury, and a crop of differences with his subjects were his legacy to Charles.

The bright spots in the reign were not due in any great degree to James. The peace which he maintained was favorable to industry, commerce, and prosperity; but the light taxes which contributed greatly to the result were due to necessity rather than to policy. Also, the settlements leading to a vast colonial empire in the New World have him to thank only so far as he drove opponents of the Established Church from England. Again, while he shares with Elizabeth the glory of the greatest age of the world's literature, he was, in spite of his scholarly tastes, as innocent as his predecessor of assisting the movement. In spite of him, very notable gains were made by the Commons. They secured the right of deciding contested elections and right of freedom from arrest, and effectively asserted their right to debate all matters of public concern and to appropriate supplies for purposes which they designated. On the other hand, they protested vainly against impositions, and failed deservedly in an attempt to judge and punish offenses not committed against their own House.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

Narrative. F. C. Montague, *Political History of England*, 1603–1660 (1907), an accurate account of the main course of events. G. M. Trevelyan, *England under the Stuarts*, 1603–1714 (1904), a work of unusual brilliancy and suggestiveness, an excellent supplement to Montague. *Cambridge Modern History*, III. S. R. Gardiner, *History of England*, 1603–1642 (10 vols., 1883–1884), a monumental work, the authority on the period, but confined almost exclusively to the political and ecclesiastical aspects of the subject. L. von Ranke, *History of England* (6 vols., Eng. tr., 1875), next to Gardiner the best detailed work, particularly valuable for foreign relations. Lingard, already cited. T. Carlyle, *Historical Sketches* (1891), a picturesque and stimulating work.

Special. Seeley, *British Policy*. J. Corbett, *England in the Mediterranean* (1904). J. N. Figgis, *The Divine Right of Kings* (1896). Algernon Cecil, *A Life of Robert Cecil, First Earl of Salisbury* (1915).

Constitutional. Hallam; Taylor; Taswell-Langmead; and especially Maitland, *Constitutional History of England, Period III*, sketch of the public law at the death of James I.

Church. Wakeman; Frere; Usher, as above.

Selections from the sources. Adams and Stephens, nos. 181–188. Prothero, *Select Statutes*.

CHAPTER XXVIII

CHARLES I AND THE PRECIPITATION OF THE CONFLICT BETWEEN KING AND PEOPLE (1625–1640)

Personal Traits of Charles I. — Charles I had many of the qualities of a popular Sovereign. Handsome and of a noble presence, he was a skillful athlete and bore himself with the courage of a thoroughbred. Keenly appreciative of all that was beautiful in the world about him, he was at the same time deeply religious, and lived unspotted amidst the dissipations of his Court. On the other hand, he lacked that power of reading the temper of the times and that gift of voicing the feelings of his subjects which had made the Tudors so irresistible. Without the imagination and sympathy necessary to the understanding of other men's views, he regarded every one who differed from him as an enemy; while he prided himself on the legality of his measures he failed to see that what had the sanction of the law might at times be absolutely inexpedient. Much influenced by the few to whom he gave his confidence, he clung obstinately to an opinion he had once formed. Worse than all, he was secretive and evasive; he made promises which he found himself unable to keep, and sometimes even entered into engagements with mental reservations which would enable him to elude what he did not consider to be for the public good.

Political Problems. — Spurred on by Buckingham he had aroused popular enthusiasm by forcing the timid old King to abandon his peace policy, but he and his favorite planned to conduct the war in a manner quite out of accord with that advocated by Parliament; they entered into engagements which that body was not asked to approve, and they conducted their military operations with a rashness, an incompetence, and a lack of success which forfeited the confidence of the nation. Consequently, the Commons, when they were called together, would not grant the supplies necessary to meet the situation. This forced the King to resort to the irregular measures which, in conjunction with his religious policy, led to the revolt which finally cost him his head.

Religious Problems. — While the Puritans had failed to receive under James the concessions which they desired, they had not been

actively persecuted. Silently but effectively their views were being preserved and spread by means of Bible reading, prayer, and services in private houses. Already chafing under restraint, the victories of the Catholics in the Continental war, the King's marriage, and the relaxation of the penal laws aroused their gravest apprehensions. Furthermore, while James had been content with the existing Establishment, Charles was a High Churchman, who wanted, so far as possible, to restore the liturgy and the ecclesiastical organization of the pre-Reformation days, partly because he loved the splendid ancient ceremonial, but chiefly because of the chance to strengthen his royal powers. The high Anglican divines, as a means of securing the great offices in Church and State and counteracting the Puritan tendencies of the people, sought his ear and magnified the prerogative to ridiculous heights. So the issue was not merely religious, it was political as well. Two parties were ranged against each other, one in close alliance with the Crown, the other with Parliament.

The Puritan Parliamentary Party. — Though the Puritan party included high-souled cultivated gentlemen, poets, and scholars, its general attitude was hard and ungracious. The spirit of the Renascence appealed but little to them. The old English Sunday with its picturesque and boisterous merriment was an abomination in their eyes. Standing for the literal interpretation of the Scriptures, many had scant sympathy for philosophical and historical studies. They wanted to enter the lists against the great Catholic combination on the Continent, but only after the King had redressed domestic grievances and had agreed upon a plan of hostilities of which they approved. At home they insisted upon the enforcement of the penal laws, and, as the event proved, they desired also to put down the Anglicans as well as various sects of religious extremists which had recently sprung up. They did not oppose an Established Church as such, but they opposed one upheld by the Crown and Bishops — a Church which they held responsible for the prevailing moral laxness, particularly at Court, a Church with ceremonies which they denounced as " popish " idolatries imposed by authority. The Puritans fought, not for any principle of toleration, but for their own supremacy; yet, in so doing, they deepened the spiritual independence of the people, they struck at despotism, and, if they did not gain the ascendancy at which they aimed, they secured a large measure of political freedom for their country and prepared the way for a religious liberty that came slowly but none the less surely.

The High Church Royalist Party. — The High Church party, ranged against them, stood for a revival of medieval ceremonialism and held

exalted views regarding the origin and functions of the Church. While the Puritan regarded the Bible as the sole source of Christian truth, this party insisted that it must be interpreted according to the writings of the early Fathers and of the customs of the primitive Church. They laid stress on the divine origin of Episcopacy, and maintained that the observance of the Sacraments of the Church was as essential to salvation as personal holiness. While the standpoint of the royalist party was broader than that of the Puritans, it was unfortunate that they sought to impose their views by insisting upon absolute conformity and by magnifying the King's prerogative in Church and State as a means of crushing their opponents. Yet both parties were equally intolerant and both were equally aggressive.

The Royal Advisers. — Incompetent himself to deal with the political and religious problems which confronted him, Charles was peculiarly unfortunate in his advisers. Indeed, it is an evidence of his incapacity that he should have chosen such men. Buckingham was rash, self-confident, and incapable, and he was largely responsible for the foreign disasters and the constant conflicts with Parliament which marked the four years of his ascendancy from 1624 to 1628. Worse still was Queen Henrietta Maria, who proved an evil genius to the King and the country; bred in an atmosphere of absolutism and Catholicism, ignorant of the ways and temper of Englishmen, and dominated by papal agents, she put worthless men into office, and egged Charles on to some of his rashest and most unpopular acts, culminating in a disastrous policy of foreign intrigue. Abler far than these mischievous councilors and the group of religious enthusiasts who surrounded the throne were Charles's two later councilors, Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford, and William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury, though they pushed him still further toward his final ruin.

Charles's First Parliament. — The royal supporters in Charles's first Parliament, which met 18 June, 1625, were few and weak, while the King made the fatal mistake of not explaining at once what he meant to do, how much he needed, and for what objects. The Opposition, counting many effective leaders, had no sympathy with a Continental war, they were determined to keep control of the taxes, and were bitterly suspicious of relaxations in favor of the Roman Catholics. So, after voting an absolutely inadequate supply, they fell to discussing grievances and foreign policy. When they began to express their distrust of the royal advisers, especially Buckingham, who had aroused such enthusiasm in James's last Parliament, Charles ordered a dissolution, 12 August.

The Cadiz Expedition, 1625. — That autumn, Charles and Buckingham, hoping to increase their scanty funds by rich booty and to recover their lost prestige by a glorious success, sent an expedition against Cadiz. The invaders were unable to take the town, or to capture the ships in the harbor, and allowed a treasure fleet to slip by them. The troops got drunk on Spanish wine and became unruly. Storm-tossed, starving, and sick, the expedition straggled back to Plymouth late in November, another miserable failure.

Charles's Second Parliament and the Impeachment of Buckingham (1626). — Pressed by his financial needs, Charles very reluctantly called a second Parliament, which met 6 February, 1626. To guard against resistance the leaders of the Opposition in the last Parliament had been disqualified for reëlection, but an unexpected opponent came to the front, Sir John Eliot, vice-admiral of Devon. Though he had formerly been a friend of Buckingham, the shameless miscarriage of the Cadiz expedition and the deplorable condition of the returning soldiers and sailors had inflamed his wrath and stirred his pity. At once he forced the fighting by demanding an inquiry into the " recent disaster," denouncing Buckingham as the cause of all the mischief. Eliot, though violent and partisan, was a lofty-minded patriot, not in any sense a republican but an advocate of a form of monarchy in which Parliament should be supreme. Following his attack, articles of impeachment against Buckingham were framed, in which he was accused, among other things, of gross neglect and mismanagement of public affairs. Although the King had supported the favorite in all his acts, and, by assuming the responsibility, placed an insurmountable obstacle in the way of conviction, nevertheless, Buckingham's mismanagement and incompetence were publicly exposed, while, for the first time since the pre-Tudor period, the Commons had ventured, on grounds of public policy, to assail a Minister enjoying the unlimited confidence of the Sovereign. To be sure, Charles finally stopped the impeachment by a dissolution, but, in so doing, he lost the grant which the Commons had resolved to vote him. Hard put to it for money he tried all sorts of devices, and at length resorted to a forced loan, dismissing Chief Justice Crewe because he would not declare it legal. Some eighty gentlemen, including Eliot and Wentworth, were imprisoned for refusing to lend, while many of the commoner sort were pressed as soldiers. Out of £350,000 asked for £236,000 was secured, but at the price of sullen and widespread discontent.

The War with France and the Expedition to Rhé (1627). — In the spring of 1627 a war with France which had long been brewing was declared. Toward the close of the last reign Richelieu had exacted

an impossible promise that the English would loan him a fleet to be used "against whomsoever except the King of Great Britain." When it became clear that he was to employ it to reduce the Huguenots at La Rochelle who were in revolt, Charles and Buckingham, unable to face the popular outcry, had tried to elude the obligation by instigating the Admiral in command to stir his crews to mutiny. Eventually the French got the ships without the men. Such double dealing accentuated the distrust of the English and alienated the French. Two other causes of friction were: that French ships trading with Spain and the Netherlands were searched and condemned even before formal trial in the English prize courts, and that King Charles was not only unable to relax the penal laws against the English Catholics but was even obliged to dismiss the Queen's French attendants, and, after much shuffling, to declare himself the protector of the French Huguenots. As a stroke against France, Buckingham, in June, 1627, sent an expedition which landed on the island of Rhé, opposite La Rochelle, with the object of securing a base for assisting the beleaguered citizens and for attacking the French coast and shipping. Buckingham himself showed both courage and energy in the undertaking, but the English, resenting the forced loan and without confidence in the leader, gave him grudging support. As a result the French, in October, drove the invaders from the island.

The Five Knights' Case (1627). — Following this fresh humiliation, five knights,[1] who were among those imprisoned for refusing to contribute to the recent loan, brought their case to trial by suing for a writ of Habeas Corpus.[2] Fearing to state the reason for their detention, Charles had assigned no cause except the command of the King. The judges decided to send the knights back to prison, although they did not commit themselves on the general question as to whether the Sovereign might, under all circumstances, hold the subject in confinement, solely by virtue of his royal command. Nevertheless, the decision was ominous for the subject who looked to the protection of

[1] One of them was Sir Thomas Darnel, hence the case is sometimes called Darnel's Case.

[2] As it was against the spirit of English law for a subject to be detained in prison without cause shown, the writ of Habeas Corpus had been devised, in order that the judges might inquire into the case and, in view of the sufficiency or insufficiency of the evidence, release the prisoner, admit him to bail, or remand him to prison. It had always been the custom for the Sovereign, for reasons of State, to order the arrest of persons dangerous to the public safety without any further reason than the royal command. In the present instance, however, no one was conspiring against the State; the only offense of those imprisoned was resistance to unparliamentary taxation.

the law against royal oppression. Charles, still hoping to obtain the needed supplies, soon released all the prisoners, and called a third Parliament to assemble, 17 March, 1628.

Charles's Third Parliament (1628). — Before the opening of the session the Opposition leaders had met and agreed to drop the proceedings against Buckingham until they had secured redress of recent and pressing grievances. In addition to the arbitrary exactions and the imprisonment or impressment of those who had refused to pay, soldiers had been billeted on private houses, consuming the goods and menacing the quiet and security of those who occupied them. Moreover, they were under the government of martial law, which was feared as a dangerous encroachment on liberty. After sharp discussion, the Commons agreed to grant five subsidies in return for the removal of these evils, both Houses adopted a proposal of Coke's to formulate their grievances and demands in a petition, to which Charles, after vain efforts to wriggle out by means of vague promises, gave his formal assent, 7 June, 1628.

The Petition of Right (1628). — The Petition of Right, as it was called, provided that: (1) No man hereafter should be compelled to make or yield any gift, loan, benevolence, tax, or such like charge without common consent by Act of Parliament; (2) No freeman should be imprisoned or detained without cause shown; (3) Soldiers should not be billeted in private homes; (4) Commissions to punish by martial law should be revoked and no more issued. This Petition of Right has always been regarded as one of the great landmarks in the progress of English popular liberty, ranking with Magna Carta, and with the later Bill of Rights. Yet it left more than one issue unsettled.

When the Commons proceeded to formulate the more outstanding ones in two remonstrances, reiterating their demand for the removal of Buckingham, Charles forthwith prorogued Parliament with "a sharp speech," 26 June, 1628.

The Murder of Buckingham and the Rise of Wentworth (1628). — Less than two months had passed when, 23 August, Buckingham, while superintending the embarkation of a fleet at Portsmouth, was stabbed by John Felton, who combined personal grievances with a desire to perform a public service. The crime, though received with general rejoicing, only embittered the King without doing any good. While he never again loved or trusted any one as he had the departed favorite, he turned to new councilors equally regardless of the popular will. Thomas Wentworth, who had already, in July, passed over to the royalist party, gradually attained the position of the King's chief

adviser. Though he had strenuously fought the King for years, it was because he was opposed to the Buckingham régime, which ran counter to his ideals of peace abroad and efficient administration at home. An aristocrat by birth and temper he had no sympathy with Puritanism and parliamentary supremacy. The Petition of Right and the remonstrances went further than he could follow, so he turned back. When Buckingham, the chief obstacle which had stood in his way, was removed, he welcomed the chance to put into practice the policies which he had long cherished.

Tonnage and Poundage and Religious Innovations. — The two most pressing questions left unsettled by the Petition of Right concerned the royal right to levy tonnage and poundage without parliamentary grant, and religious innovations. Charles maintained that since Parliament had, in failing at the beginning of his reign to grant him tonnage and poundage, departed from a long-recognized custom, he was entitled to collect it on his own authority. The Commons argued that by the Petition of Right he had yielded any right which he may have possessed. This he denied on the ground that tonnage and poundage was not included under "gift, loan, benevolence, or tax." Since a "tax" was then generally understood to mean a direct tax, there seems to be little doubt that, technically, he was in the right. Whatever legal rights the King may have had, his attempts to enforce them were bitterly resisted. In reply he imprisoned some and seized the goods of others who refused to pay. The religious issue had reached an equally acute stage. When his High Church supporters were sharply attacked he sought to shield them by pardons and promotions. Then, in November, 1628, he issued a Declaration prohibiting further disputes on Church questions, and providing that all ecclesiastical changes, unless contrary to the laws and customs of the land, should be settled in Convocation with the royal approval, which meant by a body composed largely of the King's creatures.

The Eliot Resolutions (1629). — When Charles's third Parliament met for its second session, 20 January, 1629, the Commons began a busy discussion of the religious differences and of the treatment of the merchants who refused to pay tonnage and poundage. Seeing that he was to get nothing but complaints, the King ordered them to adjourn. The news caused a tumult, and, when the Speaker sought to leave the chair, two members, Holles and Valentine, held him down by main force while Holles repeated from memory three resolutions which Eliot had drawn up. They declared that:

"Whosoever shall bring in innovations in religion, or by favor seek to extend or introduce Popery or Arminianism, or other opinions dis-

agreeing from the true and orthodox Church, shall be reputed a capital enemy to this Kingdom and Commonwealth.

"Whosoever shall counsel or advise the . . . levying of . . . tonnage and poundage, not being granted by Parliament, or shall be an actor or instrument therein, shall be likewise reputed an innovator in the Government and a capital enemy of this Kingdom and Commonwealth."

"If any merchant, or other person whatsoever, shall voluntarily . . . pay . . . tonnage and poundage not being granted by Parliament, he shall likewise be reputed a betrayer of the liberty of England and an enemy to the same."

While the King's officers were pounding at the door, the resolutions were carried and the excited throng who had pressed and shouted about the Speaker's chair left the House. Thus ended the last Parliament which Charles was to hold for eleven years.

The Significance of the Dissolution. — A crisis marking an inevitable breach had arisen. If the King could at pleasure interrupt debate on public grievances, popular representation was an empty form. On the other hand, if his royal orders could be openly resisted, Charles Stuart had practically ceased to be King. Eliot and eight other members concerned in the recent disturbances were arrested on an indefinite charge of sedition and contempt. An attempt on the part of some to obtain their release by Habeas Corpus was first evaded and then offered on terms which they could not accept. When finally brought to trial the majority made submission. Eliot died in the Tower, 27 November, 1632. Holles escaped abroad; but Valentine and another of the eight remained in prison till 1640.

The Period of Personal Government (1629–1640). — During the eleven years that Charles governed without a Parliament he had an opportunity to do one of two things — to establish a despotism or to conciliate his subjects. He did neither. The royal impolicy was manifested in diverse ways: in vacillation and duplicity in foreign relations; in taking money from the people by methods inexpedient and of doubtful legality; in allowing Laud and his party full scope to carry out a program which ran counter to the wishes of the majority; in offending the moral sense of the graver sort by the license allowed at Court and by the harsh treatment meted out to those who protested; in breaking down respect for the judiciary, the guardian of the laws; and finally by a rash attempt to introduce Episcopacy in Scotland.

(1) **Foreign Policy.** — Buckingham's foreign policy had at least the merit of energy; but even that disappeared with his death. Peace was concluded with France in 1629 and with Spain in 1630. Then

followed a series of futile negotiations with these two countries and with various Protestant Powers. Charles aimed to recover the Palatinate and to assert the supremacy of the narrow seas; but his untrustworthiness drew on him the contempt of the great Continental leaders, while by his inaction he lost the chance of increasing his popularity at home and abroad.

(2) **Arbitrary Taxation.** — The King's irregular methods of raising money, though bolstered up with a show of legality, proved one of the chief means of alienating his subjects. He continued to levy tonnage and poundage and impositions regardless of public feeling. Perverse ingenuity was shown in the creation of new monopolies; since the Act of 1624 limiting monopolies had excepted corporations and trading companies from its prohibitions, licenses were granted to a number of such organizations for the manufacture of soap, starch, beer, and other commodities, and it was in vain that the patentees were scathingly denounced as a "nest of wasps or swarm of vermin which have overcrept the land." Although the country was prosperous and most of the financial exactions fell on special classes best able to bear them, nevertheless, discontent at the royal attempt to raise money independent of Parliament became increasingly widespread as the years went on, until a crisis came in the year 1637.

(3) **Religion and Morals. The Laudian Policy.** — Meantime, the differences in questions of religion and morals were reaching an acute stage. The King's chief agent in Church affairs, Archbishop Laud, by his influence in the Privy Council, and by his control of the courts of High Commission and Star Chamber, gathered into his hands all the machinery, both ecclesiastical and temporal, for enforcing his drastic policy. He was a tireless worker, fearless, honest, and devoted to his duty as he saw it; but he was narrow and rigid in his views, and, though he put no one to death, he sanctioned cruel punishments. Religious toleration was still practically unknown even among his opponents, but he was wanting in discrimination as well. He restored church buildings whose original beauty had been marred by neglect, he cleared St. Paul's of tradesmen and lawyers who used the holy place for base traffic, he made war on corruption and religious sloth, but, at the same time, he persecuted men who, from sincere conviction, refused to participate in the ceremonies which he was laboring to extend throughout the land. While he strove for Church unity, his test was uniformity; hence, he was not inclined to inquire too strictly what people believed, so long as they conformed. Wherever prescribed ecclesiastical rules were disregarded he concluded that there was no religion. Hence the Puritan, the indifferent, and the

profane were alike in his eyes. Furthermore, he undertook to suppress every breath of hostile expression in the press, in the pulpit, the parish church, and the conventicle. Much corruption, irreverence, and neglect he found by energetic inquiry. Many clergymen were profane, abusive, and loose in their conduct, the Communion table was sometimes used as a writing desk, or otherwise desecrated; men slouched into church with their hats on, or disturbed the service outside; pigs were allowed in many places to root up the churchyard. While Laud did much good work in remedying these and various other abuses, his failure to distinguish between the worthy and the unworthy stirred up a curiously general opposition. The impious or profligate, lay or cleric, who was proceeded against in the ecclesiastical courts, the country squire who resented the enhanced power of the parson, the lawyer who chafed against the increased jurisdiction of the Church tribunals, and the courtiers who disliked the bishops usurping great offices of State were all aroused.

The Puritan Sentiment and Current Morality. — On the other hand, the Puritan conscience was shocked at what they considered to be the high-handed encouragement of immorality. In 1618, in order to counteract the zeal of certain magistrates, James had issued a Declaration of Sports which authorized the continuance of games on Sunday. There were some good reasons for this: among others to prevent idleness and tippling; and to encourage the subjects to strengthen their bodies for the more effective defense of the realm. In 1633, the Declaration, which had been promulgated in only one diocese, was published throughout the land, and ministers were ordered to read it from the pulpit under pain of suspension or deprivation. Then, in Somerset, it was the custom to celebrate the anniversary of the patron saints of churches on the Sunday following. These "Wakes," as they were called, were frequently scenes of drunkenness and disorder. When a conscientious Chief Justice made an effort to stop this abuse he was forbidden to ride on the Western circuit again. All this seemed to the Puritans nothing more than governmental sanction of Sabbath breaking.

The Censorship of the Press. — By a rigid censorship of the Press and by the brutal punishment of those who evaded its restrictions an attempt was made to check attacks on the existing system. Many of those suppressed or punished were violent and abusive in their language and unreasonable in their standards, but there was much to justify their protests, so that, in silencing them, voices were stifled that cried for better things. The first sufferers, in spite of the cruel pains inflicted on them, attracted little attention. Among them was

Alexander Leighton, a fiery and uneasy Scot. In his writings he had alluded to the Queen as a "Canaanite and an idolatress" and had attacked the bishops as "trumpery of anti-Christ" whom he counseled Parliament to smite under the fifth rib; so, in 1630, he was arrested, sentenced to pay a fine of £10,000, to have his ears cropped, be pilloried, and whipped and to remain in prison for life. Though part of the sentence was remitted he was only released from prison ten years later. In 1632 William Prynne, a barrister of vast learning but narrow-minded and contentious, denounced the theater in a work entitled *Histriomastix; a Scourge of Stage Players*, and received as hard measure as Leighton. Continuing his jeremiads from prison he was called to account again, in 1637, together with two others, chiefly for onslaughts on the Episcopacy. Each was sentenced in the Star Chamber to pay a fine of £5000, to stand in the pillory, to lose his ears,[1] and to be imprisoned. But, whereas the former sentences had passed unnoticed, this time the sufferers were surrounded by a sympathetic grieving multitude; nevertheless, in company with John Lilburne, another tempestuous spirit who was caught circulating Puritanical books, they had to languish in prison till 1640.

Fear of the Revival of Roman Catholicism. — Another thing which contributed to alienate the subject was the widespread suspicion that the King and his advisers were on the road to Rome. Laud, as a matter of fact, regarded the Roman Church as a branch of the Catholic communion, but thought it was severed by errors and innovations from the truer traditions preserved in the Church of England; Charles, too, was stanchly Anglican; but the Queen was a Roman Catholic, and many of the Court ladies were attracted by the gorgeous Roman ritual. Moreover, the King, in his desire to please Henrietta Maria, admitted papal legates and allowed concessions to worshipers of the old faith, and a number of conversions resulted. Laud did all in his power to check the movement; but he was far from successful.

The Convergence of Discontent (1637). — The significance of the discontent aroused by the Laudian policy is difficult to realize in the present day when men have such varied interests, when they may think what they like, and worship where they please. In the early seventeenth century the mass of Englishmen, beyond the routine of their daily life, had almost no intellectual resource save religion,

[1] Since Prynne's ears were already cropped, the stumps were gleaned and he was branded with the letters "S. L.," that is, "Seditious Libeler," but he interpreted them to mean "Scars of Laud."

and they were obliged to worship in the parish church. When they were forced to participate in ceremonies which many of them regarded as idolatrous and to hear doctrines which their reason could not accept, it was inevitable that their pent-up fury would burst forth with terrific consequences when the chance offered. For years, however, after the crisis of 1629, there was no open resistance. The reasons are obvious: no machinery existed for focusing and expressing public discontent. The press was muzzled; there were no public meetings, and, if any had been attempted, they would have been suppressed as seditious riots; there was no party organization or no adequate means of communication. Even gatherings at the tavern or ale houses or at the homes of the great merchants and gentry were dangerous, for they might be reported by spies; so the bulk, even of the Puritans, conformed to the ecclesiastical regulations, either half-heartedly or sullenly, most of them meeting to worship and pray in secret, while others fled to America to develop in the New World religious and political ideas and practices which were stifled in the old. The turn of the tide in England came in 1637 — first, the popular demonstration about the pillory for Prynne and his fellow sufferers, then the case of John Hampden, and a rising in Scotland.

(4) **Ship Money. Origin and Aim.** — All of the King's ingenious but ill-judged financial expedients had been unpopular; ship money proved to be the most "famous and disastrous" in its consequences. It called forth the first notable resistance and it convinced the mass of the subjects that they could not depend upon the judges to protect popular rights.[1] There was no doubt that Charles was confronted by an urgent problem. The French, rapidly developing their maritime resources, were in negotiation with the Dutch, who had the greatest mercantile fleet and the finest navy afloat, for the partition of the Spanish Netherlands, while, in addition, English shipping was gravely menaced by pirates from Algiers and Dunkirk who scoured the Channel. Her merchant marine was in a deplorable state compared with the glorious days of Elizabeth, and the sovereignty of the seas, asserted by English monarchs since the first Edward, was in danger of becoming an empty boast. It was at this critical juncture that Charles, at the suggestion of his Attorney-General Noy, called on his subjects for ship money. With his characteristic want of frankness he concealed designs for maintaining the supremacy of the narrow seas and protecting the Spanish Netherlands

[1] They were still consulted beforehand, and those who showed the slightest independence were dismissed. This happened to Crew in 1626; to Walter in 1629; to Heath in 1634.

against the French and Dutch, alleging merely that he aimed to clear the Channel of pirates.

It was an old custom to call on the port towns and maritime counties for ships, while the levying of money instead, though very infrequent, was not unknown. The first of the writs which Charles now issued, in October, 1634, was confined to the port towns. Since the country was at peace and since money and not ships were asked for, the suspicion arose that a new scheme of direct taxation independent of Parliament was intended. In spite of some grumbling, however, the levy was paid without resistance, and, during the summer, Charles actually sent out a fleet which did good service. On 4 August, 1635, a second writ was issued calling for twice the amount of the first and including the inland towns and counties. Public opinion was so roused that Charles consulted the judges in December and obtained an opinion that: "When the Kingdom was in danger, whereof his Majesty was the only judge, the charge ought to be borne by the Kingdom in general." When a third and even a fourth levy followed, in 1636 and 1637, it became evident that there was an opportunity for a permanent and general tax — "an everlasting supply for all occasions." Feeling surged higher and higher, and calls were even heard for a Parliament. Hoping to stem the tide, Charles had, in February, 1637, referred to the judges again, and again they sustained him.

Hampden's Case (1637). — Among those who refused to pay his assessment, in 1635, was John Hampden, a wealthy country gentleman. Though it amounted to only 20 shillings his case was made the test. The trial was opened in November, 1637, before the full bench of twelve judges, and judgment was rendered in the following June. There were learned arguments as to whether ship money was a tax which required the consent of Parliament, also as to whether inland towns and counties were included in the obligation to furnish ships; but the main issue developed over the question as to whether, in time of danger, the King had the right of levying the money of the subject for the defense of the realm, and whether the King was the sole judge of such danger. Charles's extreme supporters took a position according to which the long battle which Parliament had been waging for centuries to secure the power of the purse had been fought in vain. The Sovereign, by the simple assertion that the Kingdom was in danger, could impose whatever taxes he chose.

Seven of the twelve decided against Hampden, in spite of the fact that, at the time of his refusal to pay, the Kingdom was in no danger of invasion. For nearly four years ship money continued a

legal source of revenue and was occasionally collected. It was evident that the judges would not protect the liberties of the subject, and that some of them at least had scant regard for what Parliament had gained in the past. With dependence on established law thus shaken, the way was opened for Revolution.

(5) **The Crisis in Scotland.** — The outbreak in Scotland, which also began in the memorable year 1637, was fraught with two notable consequences. It forced the King to call another Parliament, thus giving his English subjects a chance for concerted action which culminated in civil war; furthermore, it threw the Scotch on the parliamentary side, a fact which contributed appreciably to Charles's ultimate defeat. James, who boasted that "he knew the stomach" of his Scotch subjects, had been very cautious in his policy, notwithstanding the fact that he restored Episcopacy in a modified form. It was Charles and Laud who brought on the crisis. The Catholic marriage had aroused the suspicion of the Scots at the very beginning of the reign, and every act which followed deepened their distrust. In 1633 the King, accompanied by Laud, visited Scotland. Shocked at the lack of propriety in outward religious observance, they launched, on their return to England, a series of high-handed measures. Among them was a new Book of Canons or rules for ecclesiastical government, drawn up without ever being referred to the General Assembly or to Parliament. Published in 1636, they declared the King absolute head of the Church in Scotland. Also, a new Service Book was issued, "Laud's Liturgy," which was unsparingly denounced because its ceremonies smelled of the mass, because it followed the English model, and because it was imposed by royal authority.

The Scottish National Covenant. — The first attempt to read the new service, made, 23 August, 1637, at St. Giles's, Edinburgh, provoked a riot. And, as the news spread through the country, Charles was soon flooded with supplications from all classes, begging that the hated liturgy be suppressed. To these he turned a deaf ear, and when the Opposition began to organize, he issued a proclamation declaring all meetings and supplications treasonable. The Scotch leaders, by way of reply, framed a "National Covenant," February, 1638, the signers of which pledged themselves on oath to defend the Crown and true religion.[1] Almost everywhere throughout Scotland it was signed with enthusiasm. Where such was lacking persuasion and threats were even employed.

[1] These two contradictory principles of devotion to Presbyterianism and of loyalty to the King played a curious part in the struggles to follow. Often the Scots were in arms against him; but only, they insisted, in defense of their religion.

Futile Negotiations and Preparations for War. — In order to stem the rising tide, Charles agreed that a free Assembly and a free Parliament should meet, and even professed his willingness to revoke the Canons and Liturgy, though he refused to accept the Covenant. He insisted, also, that the Assembly should consist solely of clergymen, including bishops, while the Scots were determined to exclude the latter and to admit laymen. In defiance of the royal wishes an Assembly, constituted after the Scotch plan, met at Glasgow, 21 November, 1638, deposed the bishops, and nullified the Canons and the Liturgy. Charles, who had only promised concessions in order to gain time, had, by the spring of 1639, completed an elaborate plan for an invasion of Scotland, and for combining with it a rising of his supporters in the Highlands. But his funds were scanty, while his troops were raw and undisciplined, with no enthusiasm except to get home safely, and his generals were men of no military experience or capacity. The Scots, on the other hand, were fired by a tremendous zeal and were drilled by veterans schooled in the Continental wars. Indeed, their commander, Alexander Leslie, later Earl of Leven, had been trained under Gustavus Adolphus, the greatest captain of the age.

The First Bishops' War (1639). — The royalist risings in the Highlands came to nothing, and when the two armies on the Border were brought face to face neither wished to fight. For Charles it meant certain defeat, while the Scotch feared the consequences of a victory which might rouse the national pride of Englishmen to rally to the support of the King. It is said that only one man was killed, and he by accident, in the whole war. With both sides ready to come to terms a treaty was easily arranged. The Scots agreed to disband, while Charles agreed to leave the ecclesiastical questions in dispute to a General Assembly and the civil questions to a free Parliament. The Assembly, which met at Edinburgh, 12 August, replaced the Episcopal by the Presbyterian system, and imposed the Covenant upon the whole nation, while Charles, again merely to gain time, ratified all its measures, though when the Scotch Estates met and confirmed these measures they were dissolved. Later, they met again, 2 June, 1640, on their own authority and prepared to resume the war.

Wentworth in Ireland. Recall to England as Chief Minister. — Charles, too, had been making ready to renew hostilities. His chief adviser was Thomas Wentworth, whom he recalled, in September, 1639, from Ireland where he had served as Lord Deputy since 1633. He had ruled with a strong hand and greatly improved the material conditions of the country. He had suppressed piracy, protected

trade, and encouraged the flax culture in the north, he had developed a well-disciplined army, he had been successful in managing Parliament and using it as a source of supplies. Also, he had endeavored to reform the Church in order to employ it against the ascendancy of Rome. Yet he had only accentuated the bitterness of the subject people. Besides having to contend against the religious prejudice and anti-English feeling of the natives and the greed of the English officials and colonists, he was also harsh, impatient of opposition, and high-handed in his methods. In order to keep Ireland to some degree dependent on England, he discouraged the wool manufacture and kept salt as government monopoly. Moreover, he was guilty of unjust evictions in the province of Connaught. On the whole, he carried out in Ireland the rule of "thorough"[1] which he and Laud in their correspondence advocated for England.

The Short Parliament (13 April–May, 1640). — In January, 1640, Wentworth was created Earl of Strafford. Influenced by his success with the Irish Parliament, he advised Charles to call an English Parliament, which might grant the supplies needed to put down the Scots, or by its refusal give the King an excuse to act on his own authority. When the session opened, 13 April, all of the leading opponents of the royal policy were present. Although far from extreme in their attitude, they were determined upon redress of grievances, while the King insisted that a grant of supplies should come first. John Pym, a veteran who had sat in every Parliament since 1614 and who, from the leadership which he now assumed, came to be known as "King Pym," opened with a stirring speech. In a masterly survey of the events of the session of 1629 and of the period of personal rule which followed, he summed up the popular complaints under three heads: breaches of parliamentary privilege; innovations in religion; and invasions of private property. Committees were appointed to consider each of these subjects. Finding that there was little chance of getting any money without concessions which he was unwilling to make, and that the Opposition leaders were treating with the Scots, Charles ordered a dissolution, 5 May. Although the Short Parliament only sat three weeks and did not pass a single measure, its work was memorable; for it brought the chiefs of the people together and gave them an opportunity to discuss and formulate the popular discontent against the Crown.

Devices for Raising Money after the Short Parliament. — Strafford, in the Privy Council, held that, since Parliament had refused to

[1] That is, carrying "through" a policy regardless of consequences. The two words meant the same in those days.

vote the required supplies, the King was "absolved from all rules of government." His violence and arbitrariness knew no bounds: he proposed that an army should be raised in Ireland to assist in reducing "this Kingdom" — whether Scotland or England is not quite certain. Hampden, he declared, should be "well whipped into his right senses," for going to law about ship money. When the City refused a loan he proposed that some of the aldermen be hanged as examples. All sorts of expedients were tried to raise funds — ship money and its military equivalent, "coat and conduct" money for the equipment and transport of troops, were levied; futile attempts were made to raise loans from Spain and the Pope; while a proposal to debase the currency, known as "the abominable project of brass money," came to nothing. These and various other schemes proved as unproductive as they were unpopular.

The Second Bishops' War, 1640. — On 23 August, Charles joined his army at York. It consisted mainly of pressed men, ill-equipped, discontented, Puritan in sentiment, and violently suspicious of its officers, many of whom were reputed Romanists. The Scots, having issued a manifesto declaring that they were merely seeking their rights, and that they were in full sympathy with the English, crossed the Border, brushed the King's forces aside, and occupied the two counties of Durham and Northumberland. In the face of the crisis Charles was forced to consent to summon another Parliament. Before it assembled he called a Great Council of the Peers — the first of the sort since the reign of Edward III — to meet him, 24 September, at York. This body guaranteed a large loan and opened negotiations with the Scots at Ripon. It was finally agreed that the invaders should remain in possession of Durham and Northumberland and receive £850 a day until a definite peace was signed; then the negotiations were transferred to London, where they were concluded the following August. On 28 October, 1640, the Great Council was dissolved and a few days later Parliament met.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

For narrative, constitutional, and special references, see ch. XXVII. Also Gardiner, *Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution* (1899), introduction, a good summary, and G. P. Gooch, *English Democratic Ideas in the Seventeenth Century* (1898).

Biography. P. Gibbs, *George Villiers, First Duke of Buckingham* (1908) rather gossipy. I. A. Taylor, *The Life of Queen Henrietta Maria* (1905). Macaulay, essay on Hampden. Goldwin Smith, *Three English Statesmen* (1868), Pym, Cromwell, and Pitt. H. D. Traill, *Strafford* (1889). W. H.

Hutton, *Laud* (1895). D. Masson, *The Life of John Milton* (6 vols., 1859–1880); every other chapter is devoted to the general history of the times.

Contemporary. Clarendon, *History of the Great Rebellion* (best ed. W. D. Macray, 6 vols., 1886), a literary and historical classic; but must be read with caution, owing to the inaccuracies and prejudices of the author. Lucy Hutchinson, *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson* (best ed. C. H. Firth, 2 vols., 1885), a rather idealized picture of the highest type of Puritan gentleman. Peter Heylyn, *Cyprianus Anglicus* (1668), a life of Laud by an avowed admirer.

Church. W. H. Hutton, *History of the English Church from the Accession of Charles I to the Death of Anne* (1903).

Scotland and Ireland. P. H. Brown, Scotland. *Cambridge Modern History*, IV. Turner, Joyce, and Bagwell.

Selections from the sources. Adams and Stephens, nos. 189–194. Gardiner, *Documents*, nos. 1–25.

CHAPTER XXIX

FROM THE OPENING OF THE LONG PARLIAMENT TO THE OUTBREAK OF THE CIVIL WAR (1640–1642)

The Opening of the Long Parliament. Temper and Aims. — The body which assembled, 3 November, 1640, came to be known as the Long Parliament and was destined to sit through years perhaps the most eventful in English history. While most of the men who had found seats in the Short Parliament were reëlected in the autumn of 1640, the temper both of the members and of those who returned them had changed. Convinced by the developments of the intervening months that Charles and his councilors were conspiring to crush their religious and civil liberties and to introduce "Popery," they now determined not only to remove existing grievances, but to "pull up the causes of them by the roots." Even yet, however, their intentions were not revolutionary: they designed merely to make it impossible for the King to govern without a Parliament; to do away with his arbitrary power of taxing and administering justice; to safeguard Protestantism, and to punish the evil advisers whom they blamed for leading the King astray. While they were pretty generally agreed upon their political program, a split came on the religious question; one party wanted to abolish Episcopacy outright, the other party wanted only to modify it. The inevitable conflict encouraged the shifty King to start intriguing again in order to recover what he had yielded, and convinced the extremists that there was no hope of peace and safety until Charles Stuart had ceased to live.

The Opposition Leaders in the Commons Pym and Hampden. — The party chiefs who had succeeded Eliot and his fellows differed from their predecessors in organizing a great popular movement outside the walls of Parliament. For years they had been meeting and maturing their plans in the country houses of wealthy peers and commoners. When the Short Parliament revealed the temper of the nation they began to act. They entered into negotiations with the Scots; they organized the petition for a new Parliament, and, during the autumn elections, they rode about the country influencing voters to choose Puritan representatives. Until his death, in December, 1643,

the leading spirit in the popular opposition was John Pym. Added to unusual abilities as a debater and parliamentary tactician, he had rare gifts of popular management. According to his theory, Parliament was the chief element in the constitutional life of the nation, of the two Houses the lower was superior, while the rights of the people transcended both. He never was a Republican, though events might have made him such had he lived. He was opposed to the Bishops, whom he regarded as agents of royal despotism; but he advocated in place of Episcopal, not Presbyterian but Parliamentary control of the Church. Pym's closest associate and supporter was John Hampden, whom the Ship Money Case made a central figure in the struggles against the Crown. Hampden's influence was due as much to his high rank and to his character as to his abilities; he was absolutely fearless, free from private ambition, and possessed of a wonderful ascendancy over men. Like Pym, he sought to bring about a reconciliation with Charles and his people rather than to do away with the Monarchy; on the other hand, he gradually became an advocate of a "root and branch" extirpation of Episcopacy. Pym and Hampden were the centers of a small group, forming the "engine which moved all the rest."

Cromwell, Vane, and Hyde. — Oliver Cromwell (1599–1658) who had entered the House of Commons in 1628, and represented Cambridge in the Short and Long Parliaments, was as yet notable chiefly for his religious zeal and his advocacy of Puritan liberty of preaching. The fact, however, that he was a cousin of Hampden brought him into intimate relation with the Opposition chiefs; he soon became active on committees, and "very much hearkened unto." "Very ordinarily apparelled . . . his countenance swollen and reddish, his voice sharp and untuneable," and fervid in utterance, he was a man of power rather than charm. Sir Harry Vane, almost a fanatic in his enthusiasm, was an extreme liberal in politics and an Independent in religion, but had both ability and great powers of leadership. Edward Hyde, later Earl of Clarendon, was one of the most active in securing the political reforms of the first session of the Long Parliament; but he was too much attached to the Church and the prerogative to go further, so, as the tendencies of the extremists in Church and State became more and more evident, he joined the King's party and became the leader of the constitutional royalists. His *History of the Great Rebellion*, written mostly during his subsequent exile, is, in spite of its prejudices and errors of fact, the great classic of the period.

The Puritan Peers. — There was a small but stanch body of Puritan leaders among the peers, a few of whom belonged to the little circle dominated by Pym and Hampden. Chief among them were the Earls

of Essex and Manchester. The Earl of Essex, a son of Elizabeth's favorite, became the first commander-in-chief of the Parliamentary army, but though actuated by a high sense of duty, he lacked assertiveness, his abilities were too slender for the difficult situation, and he soon had to make way for a leader of more robust fiber. The Earl of Manchester was "a sweet meek man" who for a time commanded the army of the Association of Eastern Counties, but was also forced into retirement for lack of vigor.

Early Work of the Long Parliament. — Charles could not dismiss this Parliament nor could he resist its measures; for it was absolutely necessary for him to obtain a grant, either to pay off the Scottish invaders or to raise another army to resist them. London became the center of stirring activity. Pamphlets on religion and politics and fervid sermons contributed to spread radical ideas and to rouse men to carry them into effect; sects multiplied; while mobs of howling apprentices and even of once sober tradesmen menaced the Court at Whitehall and fanned the zeal of Parliament at Westminster. As an act of tardy justice the victims of the Star Chamber prosecutions, Prynne, Leighton, and Lilburne, were released and welcomed in the City with every manifestation of joy. Parliament's valiant labors during the few months of its first session group themselves under three main heads: (1) proceedings against the King's evil councilors; (2) curtailing the royal powers of arbitrary taxation and administration of justice; (3) attempts at religious reforms.

(1) **Impeachments. The Trial and Execution of Strafford.** — Parliament had sat just a week when Strafford, the "dark-browed apostate," whom the Commons regarded as the King's evil genius and their own most dangerous enemy, was impeached and placed in custody. Other impeachments followed in swift succession. Some escaped, but Laud, "too old and brave to fly," was lodged in the Tower, whence he was taken four years later to the block. The charges against Strafford which the Commons sent to the House of Lords declared, in substance: that he had traitorously endeavored to subvert the laws of England and Ireland and to introduce arbitrary and tyrannical government; that he had advised the King to reduce his subjects in Scotland and England by force of arms; and that he had tried to enlist "papists" in support of his political schemes. The trial began 22 March, 1641, in Westminster Hall, which was crowded with spectators. While it was easy to prove the accused Minister guilty of tyranny and contempt of the law, it was not possible to substantiate the charge of treason. According to the existing law that was an offense that could be committed only against the King, and

the King had approved of all that Strafford had done. The charge which underlay the various counts against the accused was treason against the nation — a new offense which had never been recognized by Statute. As the trial progressed the danger increased that he might escape after all, so those most bent on his destruction proposed that a Bill of Attainder — which required no evidence — be substituted for an impeachment; though opposed at first by Pym and Hampden, the Bill passed the Commons, 21 April. Charles did everything in his power to block its further progress: he offered to dismiss the Earl, and even to give his consent to any punishment short of death penalty. But the mob which surged about Westminster demanded the head of "Black Tom the Tyrant," whose fate was sealed by the discovery of a plot, in which the Queen rashly engaged to bring the army down from York to overawe Parliament. In consequence of a dispute which arose between two factions of the royalist supporters, this "first army plot" was betrayed to the popular leaders; Pym seized a fitting moment to disclose the information, and the Lords, who had hitherto hesitated, voted the Attainder, 8 May. Charles withheld his signature as long as he could, but pressed by deputations from both Houses and menaced by the armed and excited throng, he was obliged to sacrifice his Minister whom he had promised to protect. When the condemned Earl heard the decision, he exclaimed: "Put not your trust in princes nor in the sons of men, for in them is no salvation." On 12 May, 1641, receiving Laud's benediction as he passed, he proceeded dauntlessly and haughtily to his execution on Tower Hill. He had served the King faithfully and he was put to death without a warrant of law; but he was a dangerous man who, had he been allowed to live, would have worked to destroy the liberties of the people and the lives of their leaders.

(2) **Remedial Legislation.** — Meantime, Parliament had taken steps to curtail the King's arbitrary powers. On 16 February, 1641, a Triennial Bill became law, providing that henceforth Parliament should meet at least once in three years, a design to prevent such long inter-parliamentary intervals as had occurred under James and Charles. Another measure — aimed to stop for the future the summary methods which Charles had employed to block Buckingham's impeachment and Eliot's resolutions — provided that Parliament should not be dissolved without its own consent. The King gave his assent 11 May. Secured against interference with its work, Parliament proceeded to deal with taxation and the extraordinary courts. On 22 June, 1641, a statute was passed granting tonnage and poundage for two months; but providing that henceforth "no subsidy,

custom, impost or other charge whatsoever" should be imposed except by consent of Parliament on merchandise imported or exported. This was followed, 5 July, by an Act abolishing the Star Chamber, and greatly restricting the jurisdiction of the Council of Wales and the Marches. The High Commission was done away with by an Act which became law the same day. In August, ship money was declared illegal. Unhappily, Charles, in spite of his promises, refused to accept without a struggle the limitations thus imposed upon his sovereignty. He tried all manner of devices to recover the ground he had lost; his wife, too, was fertile in suggesting expedients as rash as they were futile, while increasing dissension over the Church question offered him the hope of strengthening his party at the expense of his opponents.

(3) **The Attempt to Settle the Church Question.** — Of the parties opposed to the existing Church of England it seemed for a time as if the Presbyterians would prevail. The Scotch commissioners for completing the treaty of peace brought to London a number of preachers who at first received a favorable hearing; but the hotness of their proselyting zeal and the expense of maintaining the Scotch forces gradually made them unpopular with one section of the English popular party. Throughout that party there was a general desire for a parliamentary regulation of the Church as well as the State, and for doing away with the Laudian innovations. Sharp differences of opinion, however, arose over the nature and extent of the changes to be undertaken; there were many who demanded the abolition of Episcopacy and the Book of Common Prayer, while others would have been content with modifying the powers of the Bishops and altering the liturgy. Among the extremists, or "root and branch" men, there were at least three groups: the parliamentary majority, led by Pym, wanted a Puritan State Church, controlled by parliamentary lay commissioners in place of Bishops; a second group, made up of a few divines backed by the Scots, clamored for a Presbyterian establishment; a third party, led by the London Independents, strove for congregational control of doctrine and worship. The issue was joined when, December, 1640, "a world of honest citizens in their best apparel" came to the House of Commons "in a very modest way" with a petition, containing 15,000 names, for the abolition of Episcopacy "with all its roots and branches." For months the whole Church question was debated earnestly but inconclusively, and one bill after another was introduced only to be rejected.

The Second Army Plot and the "Incident." — The differences gave Charles "a majority in the Lords and a large minority in the

Commons"; but instead of fostering the moderate party, he allowed himself to be drawn into two wild and wholly irreconcilable schemes. One was to go to Scotland to attach himself to a party that was forming against the extreme Covenanters. At the same time, under the baneful influence of the Queen, Charles hopefully welcomed another attempt to bring the Yorkshire army to London. The Second Army Plot, which proved more futile than the first, served only to strengthen the suspicion against the King. He started for Scotland, 10 August, 1641, concealing his real purpose under the pretext that he was going to complete arrangements for the treaty of peace. While he evidently was not privy to a mad and futile plot — known as the "Incident" — for seizing the Covenanting leaders, he was suspected of complicity in it, which almost amounted to the same thing.

The Ulster Rebellion (1641). — In the autumn of 1641 the news of a terrible rebellion in Ulster reached England. Freed from the iron grip of Strafford, chafing under the ascendancy of an ultra-Protestant Parliament, and infuriated by generations of accumulated grievances, the wild and ignorant peasantry, whom the leaders from the Celtic aristocracy could not or would not control, threw themselves on their enemies with barbarous cruelty. It is estimated that 5000 were massacred outright and that twice as many more perished from starvation, exposure, fright, and other causes. Rumor exaggerated the victims to fabulous numbers, ranging from 40,000 to 300,000. The English, horrified and alarmed, attributed the outburst not to oppression and extortion, but to the savagery of the Irish worked on by the teachings of the Church of Rome. Parliament and the people saw the need of recruiting a large army to deal with the situation, but the leaders feared to trust unreservedly any considerable force to the King, because it would give him just the weapon he needed to recover the power which he had been obliged to yield. So Pym carried a motion that Charles should either "employ such Councilors and Ministers as should be approved by his Parliament" or Parliament would raise an army subject to its own control, and as a means of appealing to the people in a more detailed and formal manner than they had yet done, he and his followers pushed through the celebrated Grand Remonstrance.

The Grand Remonstrance (1641). — During the first week after the opening of the Long Parliament a motion had been introduced to draw up such a remonstrance to the King "as should be a faithful and lively representation of the state of the kingdom." It was August, however, before the proposal was adopted, and the discussion might have dragged on interminably if the Rebellion had not brought the

BORMAY & CO., ENGR'S, N.Y.

Sequoyah

matter to a head. The Remonstrance finally passed the Commons, 22 November, and was shortly after presented to the King and printed. Although addressed to the Crown, the Grand Remonstrance was, in reality as well as in intention, an "appeal to the nation," a statement of the case of the Commons against the King. It consists of a preamble and 204 clauses, which trace in considerable detail the King's misgovernment, from his accession to the meeting of the Long Parliament; describe the abuses which the Commons had abolished since the opening of the session, the reforms which they had prepared and effected and the obstacles they had met with; explain and defend the scheme of the Church reform of the parliamentary leaders; and outline the other remedial measures demanded — the establishment of safeguards against Roman Catholicism, of securities for the better administration of justice, and the choice of such Ministers as Parliament might have cause to confide in.

Its Significance. — The document is of the deepest significance. It presents a condensed but adequate history of the reign from the standpoint of the parliamentary opposition, it is a clear, concise statement of the case of the popular party, and, finally, it caused a breach in the opposition ranks resulting in the formation of a party of constitutional royalists who encouraged the King to continue the struggle. The earlier clauses denouncing past misgovernment were not opposed. The fight began over the recommendation for Church reform and waxed bitter over the question of printing, which meant submitting the whole matter to the people. Members shouted, waved their hats, and even drew their swords. During the factional fights which followed the names "Cavalier" and "Roundhead" first came to be employed.

The Attempted Arrest of the Five Members. — Charles returned from Scotland late in November, 1641. Deceived by the splendor of his reception in the City and encouraged by the split in the parliamentary ranks, he not only returned an unsatisfactory answer to the petition, but sharpened the issue by various ill-advised acts. On 3 January, 1642, in order to rid himself of his most dangerous opponents, he ordered the Attorney-General to impeach five members of the House of Commons, including Pym and Hampden[1] — charged with subverting the fundamental laws of England and inviting a foreign power to invade the Kingdom. Egged on by his wife, Charles went the next day with an armed force to seize them in person. Warned of his intention, the accused members had fled by boat to the City, and, when Charles asked if they were in the House, the Speaker Lenthall

[1] This was a most irregular proceeding, for impeachment had hitherto never originated except in the Lower House. The name of one peer was afterward added.

humbly evaded the question with the memorable words: "May it please your Majesty, I have neither eyes to see nor tongue to speak but as the House is pleased to direct me, whose servant I am here." Charles answered: "Well, I see all the birds are flown," and went away pursued by cries of "Privilege, privilege!" The incident was regarded as one of tremendous import. If the leaders of the party of reform were to be treated as traitors, and if the sacred precincts of the Commons could be invaded by the Sovereign with an armed force at his heels, there was little hope of any safeguarding the liberties of the subject in a peaceful parliamentary way.

The Struggle for the Control of the Kingdom. — Five days after his failure to arrest the members, Charles withdrew with his family from London, never again to enter his capital except as a prisoner. The next six months were occupied in a struggle between Parliament and the Crown for the control of arsenals, fortresses, militia, and other military resources of the Kingdom. Parliament saw no other way to guarantee the political and religious liberties of the people, while the King realized that he could only maintain his sovereignty by frustrating their efforts.

The Opening of the War (22 August, 1642). — Parliament, 2 June, sent him nineteen Propositions embodying their final demands, which included: parliamentary control of the army and of appointments to important political and judicial offices, the suppression of Roman Catholicism, and the reform of the government and liturgy of the Church as Parliament should advise. Refusing to accept these terms, Charles hastened preparations for war. Parliament did the like: they chose a committee of both Houses to provide for the safety of the Kingdom, they voted an army, and appointed the Earl of Essex Captain-General. Further futile negotiations followed. Then Charles marched south toward London from York, where his headquarters were. On 22 August he raised his standard at Nottingham and the Civil War was begun.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

See chs. XXVII, XXVIII. Also H. L. Schoolcraft, *The Genesis of the Grand Remonstrance* (1902) an excellent study; John Forster, *The Debates on the Grand Remonstrance* (1860) and *The Arrest of the Five Members* (1860). J. A. R. Marriott, *Life and Times of Lucius Cary, Viscount Falkland* (1907). John Stoughton, *History of Religion in England* (6 vols., 1881) from the Nonconformist standpoint.

Selections from the sources. Adams and Stephens, nos. 195–206. Gardiner, *Documents*, nos. 26–56.

CHAPTER XXX

FROM THE OUTBREAK OF THE CIVIL WAR TO THE EXECUTION OF CHARLES I (1642–1649)

The Aim of the Popular Leaders in the Civil War. — Even now that the issue was joined, the guiding aim of the parliamentary leaders was still merely so to restrict the powers of the Crown that the people they represented might be secure in their civil and religious liberties. The war which followed, and the resulting execution of the King, came from a final realization of the fact that Charles would not submit to any considerable loss of his powers, and that he was conspiring in every possible way to recover the ground which he had been forced to yield. The events of the past year had marked a decided advance in the parliamentary demands. Barring the settlement of the religious situation, the great mass of the members, in the autumn of 1641, had been satisfied with depriving the King of the extraordinary judicial powers acquired since the accession of the Tudors; with securing control of the supplies; with guaranteeing frequent sessions and the duration of the existing body until its work was done. By June, 1642, they found it necessary to demand safeguards against Episcopacy and Roman Catholicism, and control of the military, judicial, and administrative machinery of the Government. While, during the struggle, Episcopacy and Monarchy were temporarily overthrown, it was only as a means to an end — to preserve Protestantism and the law.

The Numbers and Grouping of the Combatants. — The zealous fighters on either side, however, were in a small minority. Many who had resisted the King in his encroachments against their liberties and property hesitated to draw their swords against him when the fatal moment of decision came. Fear of anarchy and dread of Puritan supremacy weighed heavily with numbers of them; another powerful check was a deep-rooted instinct of loyalty to Monarchy. The nobles generally took the King's side, though enough, like Essex and Manchester, fought against him "to make rebellion respectable."

While the majority of the gentry also stood by the King, a considerable minority were to be found in the parliamentary ranks. Of the small freeholders or yeomen the greater part in the east and midlands were Parliament men; the royalist following among this class was strongest in the west. As a general rule, the trading classes in the towns were strong for Parliament. The laboring classes were mostly indifferent, only fighting when they were pressed, or when it was necessary to defend their poor homes and their goods and chattels. The Anglican clergy were stanch in their royalism, as were the Universities, more especially Oxford, which was, during the greater portion of the war, the King's headquarters. Most of the great Catholic families also threw in their lot with the Crown.

Territorial Distribution of Parliamentarians and Royalists. — The north, the west, and the extreme southwest, the stronghold of royalism, were largely agricultural and pastoral, economically backward and under the control of landed magnates. The most productive agricultural regions and the bulk of the commerce and manufactures were in the south and east, the centers of advanced religious and political sentiment. Roughly, a line from Hull to Southampton separated the royal from the parliamentary districts, though ports and marts of trade like Bristol, Gloucester, and Plymouth in the royalist country were for Parliament. Resources of men and money were very unequally distributed, the parliamentary territory containing more than three quarters of the wealth of the entire country. Here the rich and populous London, an incalculable source of strength, was situated. But, although there were general lines of cleavage socially and territorially, "the war was not one of classes or districts but of ideas." Outside England, Charles sought aid in various directions; but with ill-success. In attempting to ally himself with the Irish Catholics he lost more than he gained, because of the opposition which he excited among his English subjects. In Scotland the Earl of Montrose led the wild Highland clans valiantly but vainly in his cause. The Queen was tireless in her intrigues with Continental Powers: for one reason or another none could or would do much; but the Catholic powers were particularly reluctant to furnish assistance unless Charles changed his faith.

The Revenues of the Two Parties. — Parliament collected the King's taxes and the rents from the royal estates in the districts which they controlled; also, since the navy took their side, they secured the customs duties. But they derived the bulk of their revenue from an excise, or inland revenue duty, and a direct assessment on lands and goods, apportioned in the various counties each month.

Charles, for his part, had to subsist largely on plunder and gifts from his devoted followers. Having little ready money and able to collect only a portion of their normal rents, most of them were sooner or later reduced to melting their plate and sacrificing their jewels.

The Two Armies. — Parliament directed its side of the war through a Committee of Safety until 1643, when they united with the Scotch. Thenceforth, Scotch representatives were admitted, and the name was changed to the Committee of Both Kingdoms. There was no standing army or professional soldiery: the forces consisted of volunteers, pressed men, and county militia or "trained bands," of which the trained bands — with the notable exception of those from London — were the least satisfactory. Since they were changed at every muster they were always raw and inexperienced, besides being unwilling to march outside their own counties. The best service was rendered by volunteer forces raised by private persons for the King or Parliament. In some cases, groups of counties banded together to put an army into the field, the most famous being the Eastern Association, whose levies rendered notable service.

At first the Parliamentary party suffered from the lack of a competent commander: indeed, most of their earlier generals were chosen because of their social position rather than their military capacity. The King was head of the Royal forces, but he was slow and irresolute, while his nephew Rupert,[1] who began as commander of horse and, toward the close of the war, became General-in-Chief, was a dashing cavalry leader, but utterly without caution and restraint. At the opening of the struggle both the sides made the mistake of underrating their opponents. The Parliamentarians saw in the King's men a body of mincing courtiers and profane swaggerers, while the Royalists contemned their enemies as shopkeepers and clodhoppers. Cromwell, however, after the first real encounter recognized the mistake his side was making, and said to Hampden with shrewd penetration: "Your troops are, most of them, old decayed serving men and tapsters, and such kind of fellows, and their troops are gentlemen's sons, younger men and persons of quality; do you think that the spirits of such base and mean fellows will ever be able to encounter gentlemen that have honor and courage and resolution in them? You must get men of a spirit, and, take it not ill what I say . . . of a spirit that will go on as far as the gentlemen will go or you will be beaten still." In cavalry the Royalists had the initial advantage, for the gentry were used to riding, hunting, and martial exercises, and exacted implicit obedience from the tenantry who served under

[1] A son of the Count Palatine Frederick.

them. The infantry were about double the number of cavalry. Their weapons were supposed to be the pike and the musket, but many had nothing but pitchforks and cudgels, while a few appeared with the primitive bow and arrow. The Parliamentary artillery, greatly developed by Cromwell, proved very effective in reducing Royalist strongholds after the King had been overcome.

The Plan of War. — In the early stages of the war neither side had any consistently executed plan of campaign. Charles's main aim was to recover London, while Parliament at first aimed merely to gain as much territory as possible, and to that end its armies wandered aimlessly about the country. It was only after the rise of Fairfax and Cromwell that a definite plan was adopted — the defeat of the King in battle and the capture of his person. Want of money, lack of discipline, and absence of enthusiasm on the part of the rank and file hampered both sides, and numberless petty engagements resulted, which exhausted their energies and obscured the larger features of the struggle.

The Campaign of 1642. — From Nottingham, Charles marched west to recruit his slender forces and supplies. Essex followed him slowly. Suddenly the King turned back, with his pursuer hard on his heels, and made for London. At Edgehill, in Warwickshire, the first serious encounter of the war took place, 23 October, 1642. The result was a drawn battle, the chief consequence of which was to convince Cromwell that his party could accomplish nothing with such a miscellaneous lot, whereupon he went off to the eastern counties to organize his famous troop of Ironsides. Essex pressed on to London, while Charles established himself at Oxford, which he made his headquarters during the remainder of the war. Before the close of the year he made one more vain attempt to reach the capital; but his failure was counterbalanced by the success of Royalist forces in the southwest and the north.

The Campaign of 1643. — The Royalists, in the campaign of 1643, again made London the objective point, planning to approach and surround the City from three directions. The Earl of Newcastle was to force his way from Yorkshire through the hostile eastern counties and take up a position on the north bank of the Thames, a contingent from Devon and Cornwall was to march through the southern counties, occupy Kent, and thus threaten the City from that direction, while Charles, with the Oxford army recruited from Wales and the west Midlands, was to approach between them and complete the line of investment. But this well-devised plan, in spite of some preliminary successes, was frustrated mainly by the narrow

ENGLAND AND WALES
THE CIVIL WARS OF THE 17TH CENTURY
SCALE OF ENGLISH MILES
0 5 10 20 30 60
EXPLANATION
Parts held by Charles I. at the end of 1643
Parts held by Parliament
Dunbar
HOLY ISLE
Philiphaugh
ARRAN
Firth of Clyde
Mull of Kintyre
North Channel
Solway Firth
R. Tyne
Newcastle
R. Tees
ISLE OF MAN
IRISH SEA
Marston Moor
York
Hull
Leeds
R. Humber
Manchester
Gainsborough
ANGLESEA
R. Mersey
R. Dee
Newark
Nottingham
The Wash
St. George's Channel
Cardigan Bay
Lichfield
Birmingham
Naseby
Holmby House
Edgehill
Worcester
Cropredy Bridge
Raglan
Oxford
Gloucester
Chalgrove
Pembroke
Reading
London
R. Thames
Bristol
Basing
Bristol Channel
Newbury
Roundway Down
Dover Strait
Carlabrooke Castle
Beachy Head
ISLE OF WIGHT
Plymouth
Eddystone
ENGLISH CHANNEL
FRANCE
5 West 4 3 Longitude 2 from 1 Greenwich 0 East 1
BORMAY & CO., ENGR'S. N.Y.

fears and selfishness of the local levies and the Parliamentary control of the ports. The Yorkshiremen would not move from home while Hull remained in the hands of the enemy; the men of the south were of the same mind about Plymouth, and Charles found it impossible to lead his forces from the west until he had made an attempt to reduce Gloucester, which commanded the navigation of the Severn.

Newcastle's Failure in the Eastern Counties. Cromwell's "Ironsides." — During the spring and early summer Newcastle with his northern army won for Charles practically the whole land from the Scotch border to the Humber, except Hull. Then he led his unwilling forces into the counties of the Eastern Association, a district which, because of its wealth and tough Puritan stock, formed the backbone of the Parliamentary cause. Here Cromwell was laboring to organize a force of men of real ideals, strengthened by effective drill and held together by adequate and regular pay. His famous regiment of horse — the "Ironsides" — which was his particular creation, is almost unique in the history of warfare. Almost exclusively men of substance, largely freeholders, none were included but "those who had the fear of God before them and made some conscience of what they did," yet, so long as they were Protestants who were not "prelatists," [1] Cromwell did not care what their sect might be. Terrible against the enemy, they studiously refrained from plunder and all manner of cruelty toward non-combatants. Cromwell not only commanded their respect by his military ability and his political and religious principles, but won their warm affection by his "familiar, rustic carriage," his love of merriment and fondness for rough games. The new regiment first showed its strength by repulsing Newcastle in a cavalry skirmish 25 July, 1643. Though they were obliged to retreat when the latter's whole army came up, the reluctant temper of his forces obliged the Royalist general to turn back, and, after a brief and unsuccessful siege of Hull, he retired to York. Meantime, Parliament had sent Manchester into the Associated Counties with a commission to raise 10,000 foot and 5000 horse to be paid for out of the national taxes.

The Royalists from the South and West Likewise Fail to Reach London. — In the southwest, the Royalists succeeded in overrunning Devon, Wiltshire, and Dorset; but since Plymouth, supported by a parliamentary fleet, held out persistently, the Cornishmen refused to march to Kent. In the west, Essex, whose army was steadily wasted by sickness and desertion, conducted a desultory and ineffective campaign centering about Oxford. In spite of the ineptitude of the

[1] That is, supporters of the Episcopal system.

Parliamentarians the Royalist forces would not march on London until Gloucester was captured; so, 10 August, Charles encamped before the city. In spite of the efforts of a strong peace party Essex was provided with a force of 15,000, from the London trained bands, to raise the siege of Gloucester. Charles, withdrawing at their approach, sought to block their return to London, and a fierce but indecisive battle was fought near Newbury, 20 September, 1643. The King's powder having given out, he slipped away during the night, leaving the London road open to his enemy.

The Solemn League and Covenant (1643). — Meantime, Parliament had completed an alliance with "their brethren of Scotland" that marked the turning point of the war. By the Solemn League and Covenant, finally accepted by both Houses, 25 September, 1643, the subscribers agreed to preserve the reformed religion in the Church of Scotland (Presbyterianism), to reform religion in England and Ireland, and "to bring the Churches of God in the three Kingdoms to the nearest conjunction and uniformity"; to extirpate "Popery, prelacy . . . and whatsoever shall be found to be contrary to sound doctrine and the power of Godliness"; and to "preserve the rights and privileges of Parliament and the liberties of the Kingdoms." The Scots contracted to provide an army, for the support of which the English Parliament agreed to furnish £30,000 a month. Their assistance assured the victory of Parliament, yet at the same time their entrance into the struggle sharpened the differences between Presbyterians, Independents,[1] and those who advocated parliamentary control of religion — differences which encouraged the King to persevere in fighting and intrigue until he finally lost his head.

The Deaths of Pym and Hampden (1643). — The alliance was mainly the work of Pym and was his last great undertaking; for, worn out with his arduous labors, he died, 8 December, 1643. In him the cause lost a matchless leader, as it had lost a wise counselor in Hampden, mortally wounded at Chalgrove Field in the previous June. They were sadly missed in the troubles soon to break out between the military chiefs and the Houses.

The Westminster Assembly. — As soon as it was decided to ask military aid of the Scots, reform of the Church on a Presbyterian basis became a "political necessity," and an assembly for that purpose met at Westminster Abbey, 1 July, 1643, nearly two months before the formal ratification of the Solemn League and Covenant. This body, made up of representative English divines, peers and commoners, together with Scotch commissioners, continued in formal

[1] Advocates of congregational church government.

session till 22 February, 1649. One fruit of its labors, the Westminster Confession, though never accepted by Parliament, remains the form of belief in the Presbyterian Church to-day, while the system of Church government — on the Presbyterian model — which it formulated was accepted by Parliament, with the qualification that it should be under the control of a standing committee of the Houses. Although partially established in some counties, the final triumph of the army under Cromwell, who stood for Independency and toleration against Scotch clerical Parliamentary domination, and who aimed to unite all Protestants who would fight against the King, prevented the system from ever becoming national.

Marston Moor (2 July, 1644). — Although at the beginning of 1644 Charles was still master of two thirds of the Kingdom, he weakened his forces by trying to garrison all the territories which he held, while his supplies and equipment were rapidly melting away. On the other hand, though the taxpayers grumbled, the Parliamentary troops were well provided and were learning their trade in the exacting school of experience. In January, 1644, the Scots under the veteran Earl of Leven crossed the Tweed with 18,000 foot and 3000 horse. Newcastle, who had only 5000 foot and 3000 horse, shut himself up in York. In April, Leven, joined by a Parliamentary army under the Fairfaxes, father and son, sat down before the city, where in June, they were reinforced by the army of the Eastern Association under Manchester, with Cromwell as lieutenant-general commanding the horse. On the approach of Rupert, whom Newcastle had summoned to his relief, the Parliamentarians raised the siege and took up a position near Long Marston, somewhat west of York, to bar his road. But Rupert "by a dashing maneuver" circled round them, entered the city from the north, and, 2 July, came out and offered battle at Marston Moor, the bloodiest contest of the whole war.[1] For five hours, in the long twilight of a summer evening, the combat raged. While the soldiers fought magnificently, it was mainly Cromwell who plucked the victory from the enemies' hands, and he earned here from Rupert the name of "Ironsides," later transferred to his famous regiment. Cromwell himself attributed the success to "the Lord's blessing on the Godly party principally." Though Rupert escaped with 6000 horse, the rest of the Royalist army was broken up, York surrendered and the land north of the Trent was lost to the King. This decisive victory for Cromwell and the "Godly party" marked a decided breach in the anti-royalist ranks; fearing that the extremists might become

[1] The united Parliamentary armies numbered 20,000 foot and 7000 horse, the Royalists, about the same number of horse, and 11,000 foot.

dominant, Leven, Manchester, and Lord Fairfax before they parted sent a joint letter to the Committee of both Kingdoms recommending the establishment of Presbyterianism and peace with the King.

Surrender of Essex's Army (2 September, 1644). — The Presbyterian wing were all the more uneasy because, in the late summer, Charles succeeded in bottling up the army of Essex on the Devon coast; while Essex escaped by boat and his cavalry managed to break through, his infantry were forced to surrender, 2 September. In London the disappointment was bitter, for it looked as if the great gain in the north was to be altogether neutralized. Charles, however, was not able to profit by his success, for his supplies were short and his troops were mutinous. On his way north he was intercepted by a Parliamentary army, twice the size of his own, made up of many elements, including the army of the Eastern Association which came down from the north. In the second battle of Newbury which ensued, 27 October, 1644, Cromwell was completely victorious, but owing to the inertness of Manchester, the King was able to slip off to Oxford in the night.

Cromwell's Plan for Remodeling the Army. The Self-denying Ordinance. — Cromwell saw that it was necessary to get rid of generals like Essex and Manchester before the cause which he had at heart could prevail. Accordingly, he made a speech in the House of Commons in which he laid the whole blame for the failure to capture Charles and his army at Newbury on Manchester, who was not only ineffective but professedly half-hearted. Cromwell and his supporters, vigorously opposing a considerable element who were vainly striving to arrange terms with the King, saw that, in addition to getting rid of incompetent and unenthusiastic leaders, they must reorganize the whole army into an effective fighting machine, well paid, equipped and disciplined, consisting of spirited, zealous troops and unhampered by Presbyterian tests. He saw that the first essential was to beat the King in the field and to postpone the settlement of other questions until that was accomplished. At his suggestion the Self-denying Ordinance, providing that the members of either House should throw down their commands, military and civil, was introduced into the Commons, 9 December, 1644. Meantime, by the New Model Ordinance, the Commons had directed the Committee of both Kingdoms "to consider of a frame and model of the whole militia," recommending an army of 14,000 foot and 7600 horse to be "regularly paid from taxes assessed on those parts of the country which were suffering least from the war." Sir Thomas Fairfax, a young and capable officer unattached to any sect or party, was named Commander-in-Chief in place of Essex. The New

SCOTLAND.
After 1603.
Aldern
Culloden
Inverness
Corrie Vairack
Fort Augustus
Alford
Aberdeen
Glenfinnan
Inverlochy
Moidart
Fort William
Blair Athole
Killiecrankie
Glencoe
Dundee
Tippermuir
Inverary
Perth
Sherriff Muir
Stirling
Dunbar
Falkirk
EDINBURGH
Prestonpans
Glasgow
Bothwell Brigg
Berwick
Kelso
Philiphaugh
Carlisle
To Preston Wigan Manchester & Derby
English Miles.
0 10 20 30 40
Route of Prince Charles Edward.
58
57
56
55
7 6 5 4 3 2

Model Ordinance passed the Lords 15 February, while the Self-denying Ordinance became law, 3 April. No provision had been made against the reappointment to office of members of Parliament who had resigned, and 10 June Cromwell became lieutenant-general.

The New Model Army. — It was so difficult to secure volunteers for the infantry that 8500 men had to be pressed. The cavalry were of a much finer type, while the officers in both branches of the service, though some rose from humble rank, were generally of good family and godly men. Gradually their zeal, guided by Fairfax and Cromwell, welded together an irresistible force, which grew steadily in strength and discipline as the King's forces fell more and more into weakness and disorder.

The Battle of Naseby (14 June, 1645). The King a Fugitive. — Forthwith, Fairfax and Cromwell started to overcome the King. They found him wandering about the Midlands, desirous of joining Montrose, who was fighting for him in Scotland, and yet hesitating to leave his base at Oxford. The decisive battle was fought at Naseby, 14 June, 1645. Charles managed to escape with half his cavalry to the Welsh border; he still had an army in the southwest; he held many strong places; he hoped to bring together his scattered forces, and, with the aid of the Irish, to be "in a far better condition before winter than he had been at any time since this rebellion began." But, though he eluded capture for nearly a year and though some of his supporters held out even longer, his cause was doomed.

Montrose in Scotland (1644, 1645). — For a time Charles rested great hopes in Montrose, who, beginning 1 September 1644, had a year of triumph, gaining battle after battle. But the Highlanders, who composed the bulk of his army, were keener on booty and vengeance against hostile clans than they were on restoring the power of the King. After each victory numbers of them would disperse to their mountain glens to deposit their spoil. With such an unstable following it was impossible to achieve permanent results; moreover, the Covenanters, who opposed him on religious grounds, were steadily reinforced by those who were infuriated by the pillaging of his uncontrollable hordes. At length, 13 September, 1645, he was defeated and forced to flee.

Charles Intrigues with the Irish (1642–1645). — Charles had also counted much on support from Ireland. In order to secure religious concessions the Roman Catholics desired to come to terms, while Charles was anxious to release for service in England the army which the Marquis of Ormonde was commanding against them, and even nourished a mad hope of employing Irish troops in England. When

the Irish finally insisted upon freedom of worship and the repeal of the laws rejecting papal jurisdiction, the King, knowing that Ormonde, who was a Protestant, would listen to no such terms, sent the Catholic Earl of Glamorgan with vague instructions to treat behind the back of the Lord Lieutenant. Glamorgan arrived, 25 August, 1645; and, although the Irish even increased their original demands, he signed a secret treaty granting all they asked. A copy of this treaty was discovered and published and Glamorgan was arrested; notwithstanding Charles's disavowal of this arrangement, he was unable to clear himself from suspicion, nor had he got the least help for all risk he had run. The Queen, who had again gone abroad in November, 1644, was equally unsuccessful with the Continental Powers.

The End of the First Civil War (1646). — Without any prospect of foreign help, it was only a question of time how long Charles and his few remaining adherents could hold out. On 10 July, 1645, his last field army was overcome at Langport in the southwest, and it only remained to reduce the garrisons and to secure the territories held by remnants of the royal forces. When the news of one reverse after another had reached him, Charles finally left Oxford, 25 April, 1646. The Scotch had offered their mediation, and, finally deciding to trust such vague assurances as they were willing to offer, he rode, 5 May, into their camp at Newark, which he only left as a prisoner. With the surrender of Oxford, 24 June, the first Civil War was practically over, though a few isolated castles held out for some time longer.

State of Parties at the Close of the War in 1646. — During the three years from the beginning of Charles's captivity to his death, in 1649, he was occupied in tortuous and futile intrigues to recover his liberty and his authority. The divided state of parties offered him at least a prospect of success. He could still count on a small body of English Royalists who were ever ready to fight again if they got the chance, and he still nourished hopes in the Irish Catholics with whom he was constantly in communication. Parliament, which had begun the struggle in behalf of popular liberties, was pledged to Presbyterianism,[1] and had of late come to be chiefly concerned with stemming the rising power of Cromwell and the Army, mainly Independents and advocates of toleration for all Protestant sects. It only widened the breach when the Army became convinced of the necessity of doing away with the Monarchy. The Scots, whose chief aim was to preserve their religion at home and to extend it in England, naturally ranged themselves with

[1] In spite of 150 new members known as the "Recruiters," who had been elected to fill the vacancies caused by the desertion of the Royalists, the Presbyterians were still in the majority.

Parliament against the Army. The bulk of the English people were anxious for peace. Pushed into the struggle by the fervor of the minority, they had undergone much loss and suffering, from the inevitable disorganization of trade, from increased taxes, and, in spite of the relatively humane character of the war, from plundering and pillaging.

Parliamentary Intolerance. — Notwithstanding the tireless intrigues of the King, it might have been possible to have effected a settlement if the Commons had not failed to realize the need of reconciling either the Royalists or the Army. To win over the former, it was essential to grant them a measure of toleration and to show some tenderness in the matter of their estates. Instead of that, the dominant party agreed that the "Prayer Book was an abominable idol in the land," and forbade it by law, while 2000 of the Anglican clergy were expelled from their benefices. Furthermore, certain Royalists were altogether exempted from pardon, while hosts of others were punished by the total or partial forfeiture of their estates. Regrettable and impolitic as was its treatment of the vanquished Royalists, it was the height of folly and ingratitude for Parliament to oppose the Army who had fought and won its battles. Yet the wrong-headed majority made repeated attempts to come to terms with the King, to get rid of the Army, and to suppress the sects that Cromwell had fostered. Many of the Parliamentary leaders were embittered from the fact that they had been excluded from the Army by the Self-denying Ordinance, though they really wanted to cut down military expenses, and by persecuting the religious and political extremists, chiefly in the Army and among its supporters, they were at least partially sincere in their hope to check disorder and confusion, to strengthen their hold on the sober Roundhead element, and to placate, somewhat, the moderate Cavaliers to whom they denied the Prayer Book.

The Scots Deliver the King to Parliament, January (1647). — While the King, since the autumn before his captivity, had been treating secretly both with Parliament and the Scots, he refused to concede anything more than a toleration for their religion, since like his father, he believed that "the nature of Presbyterian government is to steal the crown from the King's head." Indeed, he frankly told the Scots that he would rather lose his crown than his soul. For this reason, and because he refused to agree to Parliamentary control of the Army and Navy, the negotiations with Parliament ended in failure. At the same time, he alienated the Scots by his unwillingness to take the Covenant. As a result, the Scots drew closer to Parliament, and in January, 1647, they delivered up the King in return for payment of

arrears of pay and of the expenses which they had incurred in the war just closed.

Parliament and the Army. —Parliament, with the King in their hands, thought that if they could manage to disband the New Model, they might force their terms upon him and secure a Presbyterian settlement. The Army refused to agree, except upon their own terms — toleration, indemnity for past acts, and arrears of pay — terms to which Parliament would not listen, though later they offered a grudging concession of arrears. In order to work more effectively, each of the regiments of the New Model chose two agents, called "agitators," [1] who, in combination with the council of the generals, acted as a rival representative body to Parliament. Since Fairfax had no strong religious convictions or ability in statesmanship, the burden of leadership fell on Cromwell, who from his seat in Parliament and from his place in the Army Council, strove to be a peacemaker, urging concession on one hand and obedience on the other. It was only after long hesitation that he made up his mind to extreme measures, and then he acted with his customary decision and energy.

The Army Secure the King and March to London. — On 31 May, 1647, he sent Cornet Joyce and a troop of soldiers, who tore the King from his Parliamentary captors and took him to Newmarket, where the Army was then quartered. Charles went willingly, for, having failed to arrange terms with Parliament, he was glad to try his chances with the Army, who after a solemn engagement not to disband until they had obtained satisfactory concessions, began to draw toward London. They entered the capital, 6 August, still further embittered against Parliament, who, under the pressure of a city mob, had revoked such concessions as they had at length reluctantly consented to grant.

The Heads of Proposals (1647). — Meantime, the Army chiefs had sought to come to terms with the King, offering to restore him to the throne and to accept Episcopacy if he would grant toleration. The scheme of the saner element was formulated in the "Heads of Proposals," sketched by Cromwell's son-in-law, General Ireton, 17 July, 1647, and later amended by the Army Council. While allowing Parliament adequate powers for the control of the Sovereign and the administration of the government, it provided checks against Parliamentary omnipotence, and outlined a series of reforms by which the people should have more voice in public affairs and a more adequate representation. Special precautions were taken to safeguard religious liberty against Presbyterian intolerance. It was a farsighted, states-

[1] From an old word meaning "to act." The form "adjutator" is erroneous.

manlike plan, but it was in advance of the times and failed to satisfy either party: it was too democratic and too tolerant for the Royalist, and too conservative and too balanced for the extremist.

The Transformation in the Army. — In the debates in the Army Council, Ireton took the lead. Cromwell, keen as he was in seeing the needs of the moment and swift in action, was not inclined to look far into the future. It was only when he came to realize that the religious freedom which he and his companions had won at the risk of their lives could never be secure so long as Charles Stuart remained King, that he made up his mind to dispose of him and of his royal office. Ireton and many others saw, long before he did, that Charles was only playing parties off one against another until he could raise a sufficient force for a second Civil War. At first, the zealots in the New Model were chiefly in the cavalry; the infantry, largely pressed men and hirelings, contained many men who, although not deep grounded in their convictions, were rather inclined to support Presbyterianism and Parliament. A number of causes, however, tended to alter their temper. For one thing, the denial of their reasonable requests alienated them from Parliament. Then the Presbyterian chaplains, as a rule, left their regiments to enter the livings from which the Episcopal clergy had been expelled, and the preachers who remained, together with the officers, exerted a steadily growing influence; furthermore, many volunteers flocked in to replace the pressed men, infecting with their enthusiasm those who remained.

Rise of Democratic Opinion in the Army. — The political transformation was equally striking. Indeed, in this period English democratic opinion took rise. Evolved by certain advanced thinkers, it was first voiced in the debates in the Army Council, and quickly permeated the whole body. Formulated in plans for a written constitution which failed to survive, these fundamental ideas of democracy — equality of opportunity for every man, and government by the people as well as for the people, or universal manhood suffrage — after lying dormant for a century and more, came to the front in the American and French Revolutions. Extremists declared that they would have no more kings or lords — "the meanest man in England," they insisted, "had the right to a share in the election of his rulers." Since leaders in the battle for liberty had hitherto based their claims on constitutional precedents — on the birthright of Englishmen — it marked a new and significant departure when Colonel Rainsborough appealed to the natural rights of man. "The poorest he that is in England," he said, with quaint directness, "hath a life to live as the greatest he. And, therefore . . . it's clear that every man that is to live under a

government ought first by his own consent to put himself under that government." Republicanism and universal suffrage, however, were not the ideals of the majority of Englishmen of that day; fearing that only confusion and anarchy would result, many even of the Army leaders, with Cromwell in the vanguard, fought strenuously to preserve the law of the land. Yet the men whom they condemned as visionaries and fanatics, and who were unable to make their views prevail at that time, were contending for principles which are the bone and sinew of modern political life. On the other hand, the more conservative members of the party of political and religious progress were wise in their efforts to hold the radicals in check, for revolutions, unless they are carefully guided, are bound to be wrecked by their very excesses. As it was, all sorts of queer sects and parties grew and multiplied.

The "Engagement." — In November, 1647, Charles fled to the Isle of Wight where, 26 December, he signed with the Scots, a treaty known as the "Engagement," by which he undertook to allow a Presbyterian settlement for three years, on condition that the Church should, at the end of that period, be regulated by himself and the Houses. In return, the Scots agreed to support the King's demand for the disbandment of the Army, and, if this were refused, to publish a manifesto, as a preliminary to invading England, asserting certain royal prerogatives, including the "negative voice" [1] and control over the militia and the great offices of State. It is practically certain that Charles had no intention of binding himself permanently by the Engagement; for the moment, however, he was all for the Scots, and adopted such an uncompromising attitude toward Parliament that they broke off all negotiations with him.

The Second Civil War (1648). — The King counted on a Royalist reaction to support the Scottish invasion, and there was much in the situation to encourage his hopes. Among moderate men respect for Parliament was steadily diminishing, with some because of its ineffectiveness, with others because of its intolerance; many more were frightened at the prospect of Army rule; while the austerity of Puritanism offered a most unlovely prospect to the pleasure-loving Englishman. Yet it was one thing to manifest discontent, and quite another to join in rebellion; accordingly, the mass of the people, during the Second Civil War, "looked on in bewildered neutrality." Presbyterian soldiers in some garrisons declared for the King, and so did the more pronounced Cavaliers; but there were no considerable risings except in Wales, Kent, and Essex. The result was fatal to the King; for the crisis brought Parliament and the Army together once more and healed

[1] *I.e.* the royal veto power.

the breach between Cromwell and the extremists. On his way to quell the outbreak in Wales, Cromwell met the Agitators at Windsor, where at a solemn prayer meeting, lasting three days, it was resolved that: "it was our duty if ever the Lord brought us back in peace, to call Charles Stuart, that man of blood, to an account for the blood he had shed, and the mischief he had done to his utmost, against the Lord's cause and the people in these poor nations." Easily suppressing the rising in Wales, Cromwell was free to march against the Scots, who had crossed the Border, 8 July. They consisted only of extreme Royalists, for there was another Scotch party who would not fight for a monarch who refused the Covenant. Cromwell intercepted the invaders in Lancashire, and made short work of them in the three days running fight of Preston, Wigan, and Warrington, 17–19 August, while Fairfax crushed out the revolts in Kent and Essex. All Charles's plans had miscarried, and he was soon to meet the fate which the Army leaders had voiced in their prayer.

Pride's Purge. — For the moment, however, the old discord and intrigues were resumed. Though Parliament had joined with the Army in the face of pressing danger, they still were fearful of religious and political radicalism, and were even yet ready to restore the King if he would agree to Presbyterianism and aid them to suppress the sects. When, with this end in view, they resumed negotiations with him, in September, 1648, the Army proceeded to act with decision. They issued a remonstrance, drawn up by Ireton, declaring that it was impossible to devise terms that would bind the King, and that it was just to execute him as a traitor for his attempts to turn a limited into an absolute monarchy; 1 December they removed him to a lonely fortress on the Hampshire coast, and appealed from the existing Parliament "unto the extraordinary judgement of God and his people." The House of Commons continued so defiant that, 6 December, 1648, Colonel Pride was sent with a force of soldiers who, when the Commons appeared for the day's session, turned back those known to oppose the Army and arrested those who resisted. The "Rump" that remained after Pride's Purge was in no sense a representative body, but merely a group of members depending for their places on the support of the soldiers. That evening, Cromwell returned from the north, and, from this time on, he took the lead.

The High Court of Justice and the Trial of the King. — The Rump soon showed its temper by passing a resolution that, according to the fundamental laws of the Kingdom, it was treason in the King to levy war against Parliament and the Kingdom. This was followed by other resolutions to the effect that whatever was enacted by the Com-

mons had the force of law, even without the assent of the King and the House of Lords, and, 6 January, 1649, an Act was passed erecting a High Court of Justice of 135 persons to try the King, though only 68 appeared, 20 January, the day the trial opened at Westminster Hall. The King, who had in the meantime been brought to London, was seated in a crimson chair in front of the bar; he refused to acknowledge the jurisdiction of the court in any way. The charge set forth that: "Charles Stuart, being admitted King of England with a limited power, out of a wicked design to erect an unlimited power, had traitorously levied war against the Parliament and people of England, thereby causing the death of many thousands, and had repeated and persevered in his offense." Accordingly, he was impeached as a "tyrant, traitor, murderer, and a public and implacable enemy of the Commonwealth of England." The sentence was finally pronounced on the 27th, and Charles, amid cries of "Justice!" and "Execution!" was led out of the court.

The Execution of the King (30 January, 1649). — Charles was decapitated, 30 January, 1649, on a scaffold in front of Whitehall. His quiet dignity and courage made a wonderful impression on the multitude. In his dying speech, he disclaimed all guilt for the Civil War, declared against the unlawfulness of his sentence, and said: "For the people truly I desire their liberty and freedom as much as anybody whosoever; but I must tell you that their liberty and their freedom consist in having government, those laws by which their life and their goods may be most their own. It is not for having a share in the government, sirs, that is nothing pertaining to them; a subject and a sovereign are clean different things." Sincere in his religious and political convictions, no doubt, he failed to understand his people. In his eyes, those who resisted him were bad subjects and bad Christians, against whom deceit and force were legitimate weapons. The execution of the King went far beyond the wishes of the majority, and those who brought it about made the mistake of trying to cloak their action under forms of law. It was not a time for law or pity, but for "cruel necessity," since there was no hope of peace until Charles Stuart — the incarnation of obstinacy and duplicity — was dead. Many troublous years were to follow, and Monarchy and the Church of England were to be restored, but owing to the daring act of those grim men of 1649, it was not the same despotic Monarchy or the same all-powerful Church.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

Besides the general and special works cited in chs. XXVII–XXIX, Gardiner, *History of the Great Civil War* (4 vols., 1893); J. L. Sanford, *Studies and Illustrations of the Great Rebellion* (1858); C. H. Firth, *The House of Lords during the Civil War* (1910).

Biography. T. Carlyle, *Cromwell's Letters and Speeches* (best ed. S. C. Lomas, 3 vols., 1904), an effectual vindication of Cromwell's sincerity. The best modern lives of Cromwell are: S. R. Gardiner (1899); C. H. Firth (1900); and J. Morley (1900). W. W. Ireland, *Life of Sir Henry Vane the Younger* (1905). E. C. Wade, *John Pym* (1912).

Military and Naval. C. H. Firth, *Cromwell's Army* (1902) the authority on the subject. T. S. Baldock, *Cromwell as a Soldier* (1899). C. R. Markham, *Life of Lord Fairfax* (1870), anti-Cromwellian. Fortescue, *British Army*. W. L. Clowes, *The Royal Navy;* Oppenheim, *The Royal Navy;* Hannay, *Royal Navy;* and Corbett, *England in the Mediterranean.*

Church. Wakeman; Hutton; Stoughton; and *Cambridge Modern History*, IV, ch. XII. W. A. Shaw, *History of the English Church*, 1640–1660 (2 vols., 1900), an exhaustive treatment. G. B. Tatham, *The Puritans in Power, a Study of the English Church from 1640 to 1660* (1913).

Selections from the sources. Adams and Stephens, nos. 207–212. Gardiner, *Documents*, nos. 57–85.

Thanksgiving

CHAPTER XXXI

THE KINGLESS DECADE: THE COMMONWEALTH AND THE PROCTECTORATE (1649–1660)

The Commonwealth: the First National Republic. — In March, 1649, the Rump abolished the House of Lords and the office of King as unnecessary, burdensome and dangerous, later in the same month it named a Council of State to carry on the executive work of the government, and 19 May, England was declared to be a Commonwealth. Thus the first national republic in the world's history had come into being. "In form a democracy," it was in reality "an oligarchy, half religious, half military," the creation of a minority imposed upon a majority of disaffected subjects. The Anglicans, the Presbyterians, and the Roman Catholics wanted a Monarchy, with the sects absolutely excluded from power and toleration, while the bulk of the people, though indifferent in political and ecclesiastical questions, were hostile to military domination, heavy taxation, interruption of business and meddling with their pastimes. Even those who upheld the Commonwealth were divided among themselves; they included religious and political groups of various complexions, each of whom wanted a freer system, or one more suited to their peculiar ideas. The Army, too, whose pay was still in arrears, were insistent that Parliament should take steps either to limit its own power or fix a date for dissolution. Parliament disregarded the demand, and unrepresentative and masterful as it was, there is much to be said in defense of its attitude. In the event of its dissolution there was grave peril that the Royalists might raise their heads or that the extremists might gain the upper hand; in the one case, another civil war was inevitable, in the other, confusion and anarchy.

The Problems of the New Government. — John Lilburne, "Freeborn John," was the chief spokesman of the political Levelers and of many other discontented ones who demanded more individual liberty than the existing government allowed. Twice he was tried and acquitted, and once, in the interval, was exiled by a special Act

of Parliament. Cromwell — whom Lilburne had once heard declare angrily before the Council, "that there was no other way to deal with these men but to break them or they will break you" — aroused his bitterest ire. "You will scarce speak to Cromwell," he cried, "but he will lay his hand on his breast, elevate his eyes and call God to record. He will weep, howl, and repent, even while he doth smite you under the fifth rib." While Cromwell had no sympathy with unrestricted Parliamentary control, he was determined that order should be preserved. Thus, when an effort to disband several of the regiments led to a series of mutinies, he combined promptly with Fairfax in putting them down. Anarchy in England was only one of the many problems to be faced. Scotland, Ireland, and more than one of the American colonies had declared for Charles II. A portion of the fleet was Royalist, and since the attitude of foreign powers was also menacing, English ships at sea, English merchants, and English ambassadors were in serious peril. Altogether, the new Government had undertaken a tremendous and complicated task: to set up an adequate central authority in place of Monarchy; to prevent the restoration of the Stuarts; to settle the religious question; to unify three kingdoms; to maintain the sea power; to secure and extend the colonial possessions, and to safeguard and extend the national commerce. Cromwell ere long assumed the leadership in all this work and maintained it while he lived.

The Conquest of Ireland (1649). — The most pressing danger was from Ireland, whither Ormonde had returned in 1648, and succeeded in uniting the Catholic and Protestant Royalists. After the execution of Charles, they proclaimed his son Charles II and secured practically all Ireland, except Dublin. In order to meet this crisis, Cromwell was sent over as Commander-in-Chief, and in September, 1649, he appeared before Drogheda, where the enemy were strongly fortified. Setting up his siege guns, he battered down the walls, took the city by storm, and ordered the garrison put to the sword. He has been bitterly condemned for this ruthless bloodshed, though in the Irish war no quarter had been given on either side; moreover, eminent generals have justified such single acts of slaughter as a means of preventing a protracted war. Cromwell himself deplored the act as a melancholy necessity, regarding himself, at the same time, as a chosen agent to visit the righteous judgment of God upon the authors of the massacre of 1641. Yet, after all has been said, the proceeding remains the darkest blot in his career. Within ten months he had conquered eastern Ireland, Ormonde's unstable alliance fell to pieces, and the backbone of the war was broken. In August, 1650, Crom-

well, leaving his generals to conquer the natives in the west, hurried home, for the situation in Scotland demanded attention.

The "Cromwellian Settlement" (1652). — Two years were required to complete the subjugation of Ireland, at a cost, from fighting, famine, and pestilence, of the lives of a third of the inhabitants. The scheme, formulated in 1652 by the Rump, for dealing with the conquered is known as the "Cromwellian Settlement." Although the details were not devised by him, it was made possible by his victories, it met with his approval and was carried out under his supervision. The Catholic religion was suppressed, and the Celtic owners were dispossessed of their remaining lands in Leinster, Munster and Ulster, receiving nominal compensation in the wild, remote and unfruitful Connaught, while their holdings were given to those who had furnished money for the Irish wars and to the generals and soldiers.

The Situation in Scotland. — After the crushing defeat of the Scotish Royalists in 1648, the extreme Covenanters under Argyle became dominant. Bitterly opposed to the English Independents and the policy of toleration espoused by the victorious army, they offered to support Charles II, on condition that he take the Covenant. Although inclined to Roman Catholicism, the Prince was as indifferent to religious as he was to moral principles, so, in his extreme necessity, he followed the suggestion of some of his advisers "to promise anything and break the promise when you can." He had to pay a heavy price for his apostasy. He was not allowed to speak in council, he had to listen to long sermons, he was prohibited from dancing, card playing, and even from walking on Sunday afternoons; moreover he was obliged to bewail his own sins and those of his house, his father's hearkening to evil counsel and his mother's idolatry. No wonder he declared that he would rather be hanged than ever set foot again in that hated land.

The Invasion of Scotland and the Battle of Dunbar (1650). — Fairfax, who had no sympathy with the policy of the Commonwealth, resigned his command in June, 1650. Cromwell, appointed to succeed him, was commissioned to invade Scotland, and crossed the border 22 July. When the Scots rejected his advances, he was forced, much against his will, to resort to arms. Frustrated in an attempt to take Edinburgh, he was obliged, by sickness among his troops and lack of supplies, to retreat to the coast, where, at Dunbar, the Scots succeeded in hemming him in between the mountains and the sea. Very unwisely they came down from their commanding position, 3 September, 1650, and offered battle, and were scattered by one of Cromwell's irresistible cavalry charges just as the morning sun rose.

The Scots Invade England. The Battle of Worcester (1651). — Cromwell now advanced and took Edinburgh. When the defiant Scots proceeded to crown Charles at Scone, Cromwell, with daring strategy, crossed the Firth of Forth, thus cutting his enemies off from the Highlands upon which they depended for recruits and supplies. Since he left the road to England open, the Scots had no choice but to march south across the Border, though the invasion would inevitably arouse the national sentiment of the bulk of the English. Cromwell hastened after them, and Charles's army, much worn down by English forces which had been harassing his flanks and rear, was overtaken at Worcester. There, 3 September, 1651, a fierce battle was fought. Charles, who manfully plunged into the fray, after he had for some time breathlessly followed events from the cathedral tower, only fled when the last hope was gone. After six weeks of thrilling adventures, he made his way to France to wait for better times. Worcester fight was Cromwell's "crowning mercy." Scotland soon yielded, and it now remained to establish the Commonwealth securely in England and to assert its power in the colonies, on the seas and abroad.

The Sea Power of the Commonwealth. — Before the close of 1651 the fleet of the Commonwealth, chiefly through the abilities of Blake, who had won his spurs as a land commander during the Civil Wars, had successfully asserted its dominion of the seas. Prince Rupert, who had taken over the command of the royal navy, was able to accomplish little. The island possessions of the Royalists in the Channel were forced to yield, and after the news of Worcester, Virginia, the Bermudas and Barbados, which had declared for the King and where many Royalist exiles had taken refuge, acknowledged the authority of Parliament. In the two years from 1649 to 1651 the navy was more than doubled; and the weapon thus forged was soon to be used, first against the Dutch and subsequently against Spain.

The First Dutch War (1652–1654). — The first Dutch war, resulting from troubles which had been long brewing, broke out in July, 1652. The causes of friction were commercial and political. In the East Indies there was long-standing rivalry which had led to bloody encounters; for instance, in 1623, the Dutch had massacred a body of English traders, a deed for which they steadily refused to make compensation. The English, on their part, refused to recognize the right of the Dutch to fish for herring in the North Sea; against the latter's claim that free ships made free goods they insisted on searching their ships for Royalist arms; and they demanded that the Dutch recognize the English supremacy in the narrow seas by lowering their colors

when ships of the two countries met. The Estates General not only rejected an alliance with the Commonwealth, but refused its demands to expel the Royalist exiles, although a body of these exiles had, in 1649, murdered the English diplomatic representative at the Hague; nor would the Estates proscribe the House of Orange, allied by marriage to the Stuarts and openly hostile to the new English régime. Finally in October, 1651, the English aimed a blow at the Dutch carrying trade by a Navigation Act providing that no goods should be imported from Asia, Africa, or America save in English or Colonial ships, or from any European country except in English ships or those of the country that produced the goods.[1] In the conflict which followed, though the honors were about even in actual engagements, the English, on the whole, had the advantage.

The Growing Opposition to the Commonwealth. — While the Commonwealth had asserted its power by force of arms in all directions, the existing arrangement failed to win the approval of the bulk of the nation. The Council of State was efficient and honest; but the Rump Parliament contained many members who were charged with self-seeking and corruption. Then, in order to deal with the recent crises, Parliament had not only been obliged to impose heavy taxes, but to muzzle the writings of those who opposed their policy, and, in general, to resort to very arbitrary measures. Their austerity added to their general unpopularity: they put a stop to church festivals; they closed the theaters; they tried to enforce morality by law, and to stifle innocent merriment in a régime of gloom.

Cromwell Dissolves the Rump (20 April, 1653). — Finally, 2 August, 1652, the officers of the Army formulated a petition, embodying the demands of the more progressive sort and again insisting on arrears of pay. When nothing came of it, Cromwell began reluctantly to realize that Parliament was as serious an obstruction to the cause which he had at heart as Charles had been. Gradually he became convinced that the only hope lay in his assuming the executive; but, as usual, he proceeded cautiously, until the Rump planned a step which helped him to action. The members, instead of providing for a general election, framed a bill to prolong their own powers by filling the vacant seats in their body with men of whose qualifications they should themselves be the judge. Directly he heard the news, Cromwell hurried to the House, followed by a guard of soldiers. With his hat on his head he strode up and down the floor, and after an angry speech in which he overwhelmed them with grave charges, he

[1] This Act, however, which was apparently not very rigidly enforced, was not made a pretext for war.

snatched up the offending bill and, putting it under his cloak, he commanded the doors to be locked, and hurried away.

The Nominated Parliament (July–December, 1653). — Immediately after the dissolution of the Rump, the Army superseded the Council of State by a provisional council with Cromwell at the head. Fearing to appeal to the country at large, the new executive determined to secure an assembly of godly men of their own way of thinking, and, to that end, they wrote to the Congregational ministers of each county asking them to name suitable persons, from which lists they made their selections, adding names of their own. Thus, they assembled a body to which they handed over the powers of the State on condition that, after devising a new scheme of representation, it should bring its own sessions to a close within fifteen months. The Nominated, Little, or Barebones Parliament,[1] as it has been variously called, was intended to be a constituent assembly only; but, composed of zealous reformers, it chose a Council of State, appointed committees to consider the needs of the Church and the nation; and proceeded with the work properly belonging to the body it was supposed to constitute. Most of its proposed reforms were good in themselves, indeed, many of them have since been adopted, but they were in advance of the time. So, 12 December, 1653, the more moderate members held an early sitting and resigned their powers into the hands of Cromwell, while those who resisted were expelled by the troops. If the Rump had not been ready to go far enough, its successor had gone too far, and aroused the fear that it was going to introduce the domination of the sects and radicalism.

The Instrument of Government. Cromwell made Lord Protector (December, 1653). — Upon the overthrow of the Nominated Parliament, the Army officers presented a scheme known as the Instrument of Government, vesting the supreme power in a single person, assisted, and to some extent controlled, by a Council and a Parliament. The Instrument is notable as the first written constitution for governing a nation in modern times and the only one which England has ever had in actual operation. On 16 December, Cromwell accepted office as Lord Protector for life. Powers of legislation and extraordinary taxation[2] were vested in Parliament, though between sessions the Protector and Council could issue ordinances which might be afterwards confirmed or disallowed by Parliament. The Protector had no power of veto, though he could withhold his assent to a bill

[1] It got its name from Praise-God-Barebone, a leather merchant of London.

[2] A fixed revenue was provided for the ordinary expenses of the army and navy and the civil administration.

for twenty days. It was provided that Parliament should meet at least once in three years and that each session should last at least five months. The Christian religion as contained in the Scriptures [1] was to be professed by the nation; there was to be an established Church, but a provision less objectionable than tithes was to be made for its support. Full liberty was allowed to believers in Jesus Christ, though this was not to extend to "popery or prelacy" or to those who disturbed the peace or practiced licentiousness. While, on the whole, the Instrument was "a good attempt to steer between the despotism of a single person and a single House," various criticisms might be urged against it. It was not through any faults in its plan, however, that the Instrument failed, but because Parliament refused to accept it, insisting, when they came together, that it was their function and not that of Cromwell or the Army to construct the constitution.

Cromwell's Aims as Protector. — From 16 December, 1653, to 3 September, 1654, when Parliament met, Cromwell was in fact if not in name Sovereign. Having overcome all who withstood the cause of which he had made himself the champion, and standing triumphant over his vanquished opponents — the King, the Irish, the Scots, and Parliament — he had before him the one supreme task — "of healing the rancor engendered by so many years of strife; of settling a new order, political and ecclesiastical, which should rest, not upon military force but upon the willing acceptance of all good citizens."

The Protector's Religious Policy. — The religious policy which he sought to enforce was one which he adopted but did not originate. It contemplated an established, non-Episcopal Church, endowed and supported by the State, and comprehending all Protestant sects who believed in Christ, save those who accepted Bishops and the Prayer Book. For those who opposed any establishment the greatest possible toleration was to be allowed. Each congregation was to own its church buildings and to regulate its own form of worship, and no provision was made for church courts or ecclesiastical assemblies. Anglicans were forbidden openly to use the Prayer Book, but their private worship was winked at except during moments when the Government felt itself in danger. Catholics, though still subject to the old penalties for saying and hearing mass, were no longer forced to attend the parish church, and the penal laws were not rigidly enforced. The Jews began to reappear, and, though the feeling, economic and religious, was too strong for Cromwell to follow his inclination and grant their petition for a free exercise of their religion,

[1] This meant Puritanism.

he was able to protect them from disturbance; so that the period of his rule is said to mark their return to England. In spite, however, of its generally tolerant attitude, Cromwell's was a Puritan régime. Its austerity, its exclusion of the Cavaliers from political activity and the unfair discrimination in financial burdens kept alive a discontent that was soon to assert itself.

Cromwell's Foreign Policy. — Cromwell's foreign policy, which now began to shape itself, had three main objects: the weakening of the Stuart cause on the Continent, the development of England's colonial and commercial power, and the formation of a great alliance of the Protestant countries of Europe under the leadership of England. He succeeded, so long as he lived, in staving off a Stuart restoration, also he did much to carry on the old Elizabethan tradition of English maritime supremacy which had been so effectively revived under the Commonwealth, but, in his third, and what he liked to believe was his paramount aim, he was not so fortunate. After the Peace of Westphalia, which concluded the Thirty Years' War in 1648, religious interests in Europe gave way more and more to those of political and commercial aggrandizement. The northern Protestant states, which Cromwell aimed to unite, fell to quarreling among themselves, and the two great Catholic powers, France and Spain, whom he strove to keep apart, made peace in little more than a year after his death. Moreover, the Protector himself, in spite of his Protestant zeal, mingled with it a worthy but conflicting ambition to enhance England's material advantages.

Peace with the Dutch (April, 1654). — Deploring the continuance of the war with the Dutch, he concluded a treaty of peace in April, 1654, but his terms were hard and distinctly to England's commercial and political advantage. The Dutch agreed to strike their flags to English ships in the narrow seas, and to accept the Navigation Act; on the other hand, they were to continue to fish for herring in the North Sea without payment of rent, and they maintained their own views on the right of search. Each country agreed to make compensation for damages done to the other in the East Indies; concluded a defensive alliance; and agreed not to harbor each other's rebels, which involved the exclusion of the Stuart exiles from the United Provinces. Altogether, the war was a heavy blow at England's greatest trade rival and marked the beginning of the end of the Dutch supremacy at sea.

The Capture of Jamaica (May, 1655). The War with Spain. — France and Spain contended with one another for an alliance with the Protector. France, to be sure, was the hereditary enemy of England,

while her King was a nephew of Henrietta Maria. On the other hand, Spain had been the foe who inspired the glorious achievements of the Elizabethan seamen, and the Spanish religious and commercial policy was still unbearably exclusive. When England asked for freedom of religion and trade for her merchants, the Spanish ambassador declared that it was like asking for his master's two eyes; far from making any concessions, the Inquisition was rigorously enforced against Englishmen in the Spanish dominions, English settlements in the West Indies were persistently harassed, and English ships were intercepted in the surrounding waters. Cromwell's reply was to send, in December, 1654, a fleet and an army bearing orders to strike at the Spanish dominions in the New World and to seize her treasure ships, with the twofold object of breaking her colonial monopoly and striking a blow at "anti-Christ." Jamaica, practically defenseless, was captured by this expedition in May, 1655. In June, Blake, who was protecting English trade and pursuing pirates in the Mediterranean, received orders to intercept treasure ships on their way to Spain, and vessels containing troops and supplies for the West Indies. Not till months afterwards, 26 October, 1655, did Oliver declare war.

The Alliance with France (1655 and 1657). — Two days before the declaration of war with Spain, he concluded a treaty with France providing for the promotion of commerce, and the exclusion, from each country, of the rebels of the other. The treaty between France and England was followed by an offensive and defensive alliance, 23 March, 1657. In June of the next year, the French General Turenne, assisted by English troops who fought with rare bravery, captured Dunkirk, the best port in Flanders. It was handed over to the Protector, who had stipulated for this cession, partly because Dunkirk was one of the keys of the Channel, and partly because it was a lair for pirates who preyed upon English commerce.

Results of the Protector's Foreign Policy. — In foreign policy Oliver achieved much. He gained for England a high place among European Powers, he advanced English commercial and colonial interests by striking hard at the monopoly of Spain, and he took his country another long step toward that naval supremacy which she had enjoyed for the last two centuries. His cherished scheme, however, for a great Protestant alliance failed. He has been charged, too, with shortsightedness in furthering the greatness of France, a growing Power, as against Spain which was on the decline; yet it must be said that the decay of Spain was not then fully apparent, while it was the slavish policy of Charles II, far more than Oliver's alliance, which contributed to the subsequent ascendancy of Louis XIV. A more serious indict-

ment of Oliver's policy is that it took money which the country could ill spare; it diverted the Protector's attention from pressing domestic problems, and, by mingling material motives with religious professions, he lowered his ideals and stained his prestige as a godly ruler of the elect.

The First Parliament of the Protectorate. — Meantime, the first Parliament of the Protectorate had met, 3 September, 1654. Beside a small body of Republicans opposed to a strong executive, a stout contingent of conservatives had been elected who were set against war. While they desired a settled government, they were bent on having one settled by themselves. Cromwell was willing that they should alter "circumstantials" in the Instrument, but he insisted that they should not meddle with "fundamentals"; nevertheless, they set about to revise the Instrument in such a manner as to obtain Parliamentary sovereignty, control over the militia, and religious uniformity rigidly restricting freedom of conscience. Consequently, 22 January, 1655, at the end of five lunar months, Oliver appeared before them, and after a scathing speech proceeded to dissolve the House. It was one of the ironies of fate that he who desired above all things peace and healing and who had contended against despotism both in King and in Parliament, could only preserve at the point of the sword what he had struggled to gain for the nation.

The Rule of the Major-Generals (1655). — The dissension between the Protector and Parliament, and evidences of discontent outside, encouraged the Royalists to plan a general revolt in March, 1655. A single armed rising occurred which was easily suppressed; nevertheless, the unrest continued to be so great that in August the Protector divided the country into ten military districts, setting a Major-General over each. In addition to keeping order, they were commissioned to enforce the Puritan moral code and were most effective in both capacities. This increased rigor served only to alienate further the mass of the people, in whom the love of amusement was strong. Moreover, the Cavaliers were oppressed with singular and special burdens. In addition to those who were punished for participation in the recent rising, an income tax of ten per cent was imposed on all who were known to have taken part against Parliament in the Civil War. When, owing to the need for money for carrying on the Spanish war, a new Parliament met, 17 September, 1656, the whole country was seething with discontent.

Cromwell made Hereditary Protector (June, 1657). — Very wisely the rule of the Major-Generals and the fining of the Cavaliers were discontinued. While, as in the previous Parliament, various professed

opponents of the Protector were excluded, there were two leading parties, one desiring to make Cromwell hereditary Protector, the other to make him King. Cromwell professed to regard the kingly title "as a mere feather in the hat"; but when it was offered him in a revised form of the Instrument, known as the Humble Petition and Advice, he hesitated; when he refused, early in May, 1657, it was apparently only because of the strenuous opposition of the Army. Instead, he accepted the hereditary office of Lord Protector, and, 26 June, was inaugurated with regal pomp and ceremony. Most of the other recommendations of the Humble Petition were adopted as well, chief among them a provision for a second or "other House," whose members should, in the first instance, be nominated by Cromwell. When Parliament met again in January, 1658, the power of the Protector was found to have been greatly weakened, by the admission of the members excluded in the autumn of 1656, and by the promotion of his stanchest supporters to the "other House." In the face of intrigues against his authority and disputes over the relations between the two Houses, he ordered their dissolution, 4 February, 1658. "I think it high time to put an end to your sitting," he declared, "and let God be judge between you and me." It was destined to be his last Parliament.

Cromwell's Death, 3 September, 1658. — The last few months of his life were marked by growing unpopularity and disappointment. The strain of keeping up a large army and a large navy at the same time was too much for the nation to bear, while the need for money grew more pressing every day. Only Oliver's strong hand could hold in check the steadily mounting discontent. His naturally robust constitution, undermined by fifteen years of titanic labors, broke under the burden, and when, in August, he was attacked by an ague and intermittent fever he realized that his days were numbered: "I would be willing," he said, "to live to be further serviceable to God and His people; but my work is done." He died 3 September, 1658.

Cromwell's Work. — Cromwell's enemies have judged him harshly, and long after his death, the view prevailed that, starting as a sincere zealot, the taste for power gradually transformed him into a hypocritical fanatic. Such a distorted view has not been able to survive the test of fact, and now it is possible to picture him more nearly as he really was in the light of the problems he had to face. It was his unswerving trust in God and his absolute acceptance of every victory which he gained in war and in politics, at home and abroad, as a manifestation of Divine Providence, that lent color to the hostile view that so long prevailed. In spite of seeming contradictions, he pursued consistent aims — to strike at despotism under whatever form it was cloaked,

royal or parliamentary; to stem the inrush of anarchy; and to preserve the heritage for which he fought. When Parliament proceeded to contest the basis of his power, he found himself forced to adopt methods more arbitrary than those of the King whom he had overthrown. While more effective as a destroyer than as a builder, he achieved many things. He struck a blow at tyranny, royal and ecclesiastical, from which it never recovered; he gave the country an actual experience in religious toleration that helped prepare the way for the spiritual freedom which it was left to later hands enduringly to establish; he made the name of England respected abroad, and adopting the maritime and colonial policy of his great predecessor Elizabeth, he carried it a stage further along toward the goal which Great Britain has now reached. Under his government, particularly during the régime of the Major-Generals, there was rigid repression and minute interference with private affairs, and some innocent recreation was blighted by the enforced observance of the gloomy Puritan Sabbath. While certain of these measures were due to stern political necessity, others were in the interests of a high if somewhat dreary morality, and the policy, mistaken as it was in many respects, introduced serious and sober ideals which have done much to uplift the national character.

Cromwell, the Man. — Cromwell the man, so simple and human in his bearing, was a complex character embodying the most diverse traits — at once daring and cautious, hesitant in council and decisive in action. Although a religious enthusiast, he was at the same time intensely practical in his military and state policy. In his habits of life he was the opposite of a "morose and gloomy" ascetic; he hunted, hawked, and was a lover of horses; he loved his jest and was enthusiastic for games, playing bowls even after he became Lord Protector; he had an ear for music, and scandalized the stricter sort by allowing "mixed dancing" at the wedding of a daughter in 1657. But this lighter side only appeared at moments in his absorbed and purposeful life. In his last prayer he gave thanks that he had been "a mean instrument to do God's people some good and God some service." If as a ruler he came more and more to subordinate "the civil liberty and interest of the nation . . . to the more peculiar interest of God,"— if to that end he was often abrupt and arbitrary, his aims were lofty and disinterested. "A larger soul, I think, hath seldom dwelt in a house of clay," was the tribute of one who knew him best.

Richard Cromwell Lord Protector. — Richard Cromwell, whom his father had named successor, was a worthy man, of pure life, personally popular, but without force and without training or ability in affairs of State; moreover, he had no hold on the Army, whose chiefs desired

more control over military affairs than the Government would accord. After some wrangling, the old Rump was recalled 7 May, 1659. Though originally there had been no intention of overthrowing the Protectorate but merely to "piece and mend up that cracked government," the Rump proceeded to pass a resolution for maintaining a Commonwealth "without a single person" at the head, whereupon Richard, after a few days of hesitation, resigned.

The End of the Long Parliament (26 March, 1660). — The Rump was as unwilling as Richard's government had been to allow the Army to control military affairs, hence its dissolution, 13 October, 1659. While the generals were trying to devise some plan of orderly government in which they might have the voice they desired, an unexpected figure arose to dominate the situation. This was George Monck, who commanded the army in Scotland. He had begun his military career fighting for King Charles; taken prisoner in 1644 by the enemy, he had successively served Parliament, the Commonwealth, the two Protectors, and the restored Rump, and had shown unusual ability as a fighter on the sea as well as on the land. A man of sphinx-like reserve, he seemed absorbed in his military duties and indifferent to politics. Now he suddenly stood forth as the "champion of the authority of Parliament" against the designs of the generals. Apparently he cared little whether England was a Monarchy or a Republic; but, if we can believe his own professions, he was convinced that she should be governed by law rather than by the sword. On 2 January, 1660, he crossed the Tweed at the head of his troops. General Lambert, one of the Army chiefs, made a vain effort to oppose him; but there was no enthusiasm for the cause of the Army, and, deserted even by his own men, he was obliged to give way. Monck marched south, carefully evading any public declaration of his intentions. However, he at length yielded so far to the demands of the Presbyterians as to readmit to the Rump, which had been recalled again 26 December, the members excluded by Pride's Purge; but he informed the body thus reconstituted that it must dissolve by 6 May, 1660, at the latest, and make way for a free Parliament. Monck was made commander of the army of the three kingdoms, and, 26 March, with "many sad pangs and groans," the Long Parliament dissolved itself after an intermittent existence of nearly twenty years.

The Recall of Charles II and the Declaration of Breda. — Before dissolving, it had provided for a Convention Parliament to meet 25 April. Royalists were allowed to vote in the elections, though they were not eligible to sit unless they had given some proof of affection to the Parliamentary cause. About this time, Monck opened negotia-

tions with Charles; realizing that the people were weary of frequent revolutions, army rule, and heavy taxes, he may have thought that he would gain personally by recalling the King as a means of anticipating an inevitable reaction, though it is possible that he had an unselfish desire to restore peace and a settled government. At any rate, "while the Restoration was the result of a general movement of opinion too strong to be withstood," he did more than any other man to bring it about. As a result of the negotiations which opened, Charles, acting under the advice of Hyde, who was with him in exile, issued from Breda a declaration in which he promised: (1) a general amnesty for all offenders, save those excepted by Parliament; (2) liberty of conscience, according to such a law as Parliament might propose; (3) such security for property acquired during the late troubles as Parliament might determine; (4) full arrears to the soldiers according to Act of Parliament. Following a futile rising, led by Lambert, the Army took an engagement to accept whatever settlement Parliament might make. "Their whole design," wrote Pepys, the famous diarist, "is broken . . . and every man begins to be merry and full of hope." The Convention met 25 April, 1660, as appointed. After both Houses had agreed in a declaration that, "according to the ancient and fundamental laws of the Kingdom, the government is, and ought to be, by Kings, Lords, and Commons," Charles was proclaimed in London.

Nature of the Restoration and the Results of the Puritan Revolution. — Charles landed at Dover, 25 May, 1660. The Restoration had at length come as a reaction from excessive Puritanism and Army rule. Yet the Revolution had accomplished results which were never to be effaced. It had arrested the growth of absolutism; for the Monarchy that was restored was destined never again to be, for any considerable period, a Monarchy completely independent of Parliament. The Established Church, too, was restored; but it never again became the National Church, embracing every subject as such. A lusty body of Dissenters had sprung up and multiplied during the recent upheaval, and the century had not run its course before many of them had obtained a recognized legal status outside the bounds of the Establishment.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

See chs. XXVII–XXX.

Narrative. Gardiner, *The History of the Commonwealth and the Protectorate* (4 vols., 1903). C. H. Firth, *The Last Years of the Protectorate*, 1656–1658 (1909). F. A. Inderwick, *The Interregnum* (1891). Pollard,

Factors in Modern History, chs. IX, X. The *Diary* of the contemporary John Evelyn (best ed. H. B. Wheatley, 4 vols., 1906) throws vivid lights on the period.

Constitutional and special. E. Jenks, *The Constitutional Experiments of the Protectorate* (1890). Gardiner, *Cromwell's Place in History* (1897). G. L. Beer, *Cromwell's Policy in its Economic Aspect* (1902) valuable for this phase of the subject. R. Dunlop, *Ireland under the Commonwealth* (1913).

Selections from the sources. Adams and Stephens, nos. 213–220. Gardiner, *Documents*, nos. 86–105.

CHAPTER XXXII

FROM THE RESTORATION TO THE FALL OF CLARENDON (1660–1667)

The New King and the Restoration. — In spite of the fact that the Monarchy and the established Episcopacy were restored under Charles II, the old absolutism in Church and State was destined never again to prevail. The Puritan Revolution had produced an upheaval and an awakening which was bound to leave enduring results, and Charles was shrewd enough to sense the situation. To be sure, he struggled to make himself supreme, and he ended his reign in a very strong position; but he achieved his aim only by timely concessions. He recognized Parliament, and the opinion which it represented, as a force which might be manipulated but never dominated. Whatever happened, he once remarked, he was determined "never to set out on his travels again."

During the years that Charles was King, neither arbitrary taxation nor the system of extraordinary courts was revived. Moreover, notable gains were made, both judicial and parliamentary. The fining of juries was done away with, and a new Act made the writ of Habeas Corpus, for protecting the subject against prolonged imprisonment before trial, more of a reality. Parliament asserted successfully its right not only to grant taxes, but also to appropriate them for specific purposes; to audit accounts; and, by frequent and effective impeachments, to hold the royal Ministers, in some measure, responsible to itself. In this period, too, modern party organization took rise, and the system of Cabinet government, based upon it, showed the first signs of taking shape. Yet, while many good laws were passed, bad government continued, numerous traces of absolutism survived, and much that cried for remedy was left untouched. The judges, whose tenure was still during royal pleasure, continued servile to the Crown and tyrannical to the subject; except by impeachment there was no means of getting rid of those who refused to govern according to the will of the majority in the House of Com-

mons; while the King, by long prorogations, avoided meeting Parliament for extended intervals, and during the last four years of his reign never summoned that body at all.

The Early Life of Charles II. — Charles II was thirty years old on the day that he entered London, 29 May, 1660. He had received little systematic instruction from books; but his life had been a stirring one, full of harsh and varied lessons in the great school of experience. Often out at the elbows during his long years of exile, and disappointed, time and again, in his efforts to come to his own, he displayed through all his adversity chiefly the virtue of cheerfulness, and continually vexed his grave and learned councilor, Hyde, by his unwillingness to work and his loose habits. Charles's early misfortunes and privations did nothing to build up his character; they only made him more greedy of comfort and amusement when the opportunity came.

His Character and Attainments. — To the end he remained indolent, fickle, untrustworthy and absolutely devoid of reverence. Although utterly selfish, he had an easy good nature and charm of manner that captivated everyone who came in contact with him, and generally was as ready in making promises as he was careless in performing them. According to Rochester, one of his boon companions, "he never said a foolish thing and never did a wise one"; nevertheless, he was keen and persistent in any matter that he thought worth the trouble. He had an acute observant mind, an excellent memory, and a nimble wit. In person he was over six feet tall, and well formed, of dark swarthy complexion, with a cynical eye, a great fleshy nose and thick lips. It was only his magnificent physique and his devotion to athletic exercises that enabled him to keep his health, in view of the excesses in which he indulged.

His Policy. — He was quite without scruple in pursuing his ends, and sharp at profiting by the mistakes of his opponents. Although he hated the details of business and was too sensible to believe in the Divine Right of Kings, he aimed to keep as free from parliamentary control as possible: to that end, he sought to set up a standing army, to reintroduce Roman Catholicism, to secure toleration for Dissenters, and allied himself with France. He bribed, flattered, and managed, but, fully alive to his royal limitations, he yielded when popular opposition proved too strong. Thus, before the close of his reign, he gave up all his projects, except the French alliance to which he clung tenaciously; with a political cunning rare in history, he shifted to the Anglican side, and by adroit politics managed to spend his last years free from parliamentary restraint.

The Supremacy of the Lord Chancellor Clarendon. — The first period of Charles's reign was marked by the ascendancy of Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, who had accompanied his young master into exile and rose to become Lord Chancellor. He had many admirable qualities: industrious, honest, and fixed in his principles, he was a devoted champion of the Church of England and an opponent of royal absolutism. On the other hand, in spite of an unusual knowledge of men and parties, he was quite incapable of adapting himself to changed conditions, and met the usual fate of men who try to steer a middle course. He alienated the King by opposing his policy of toleration and by frowning on his pleasures, while, at the same time, he alienated Parliament by opposing what he regarded as their meddling in the details of administration. The Privy Council formed under his leadersdip, June, 1660, was constituted both of Cavaliers and Puritans who had worked to bring about the Restoration. Out of thirty members, twelve had formerly taken sides against the Crown; indeed, both within the Council and outside, there were not only party differences but differences between members of the same party. Thus courtiers, particularly women, were able to prevail by intrigue, and graver gave way steadily to lighter counsels.

The Convention Parliament (**25 April–29 December, 1660**). — After the recall of the King, the Convention set about to settle the government. Strong in the Commons, the Cavaliers dominated the Lords.[1] On 11 June by an Act "for removing all questions and disputes," the authority of the Convention was formally established. Acting henceforth as a legal body, it proceeded to take up the terms of the Declaration of Breda. The first to be settled concerned the fate of those who had taken part in the late troubles. The King had promised a pardon for all save those excepted by Parliament. While the Commons wanted to make very few exceptions, the Lords were inclined to be less lenient. Through the efforts of Charles and Hyde a moderate compromise was adopted, as a result of which, thirteen of the regicides were put to death, though some twenty-five more were given life sentences.[2] The status of property acquired during the late troubles was next taken up. Estates confiscated and sold by the State were recovered on the ground that an illegal government could give no valid title; but private contracts were declared legal, so

[1] Although those peers who had fought for Charles I, or who had been created by him since 1642, were at first excluded, they all took their seats before June.

[2] One glaring case of injustice was the trial and execution of Sir Harry Vane in 1662; for he had no part in putting the late King to death; moreover Charles II had promised to spare his life.

that many Royalists who had sold their estates to pay fines or to help the King's cause got no redress. The Cavaliers grumbled that there was indemnity for the King's enemies and oblivion for his friends.[1]

Disbandment of the New Model and the Settlement of Revenue. — Arrears due the army and fleet were paid in full, and the troops were dismissed, except three regiments. On various pretexts Charles increased this force until, in 1662, it numbered 5000 men, the nucleus of England's standing army. Another important work of the Convention was to settle the revenue. An annual income of £1,200,000 was granted as sufficient for ordinary expenses, but since no more than three quarters of this amount reached the royal coffers in any one year, it was found necessary, in 1662, to vote new taxes. Military tenures, and feudal dues and services, which had long been more vexatious to the subject than profitable to the Crown, were practically all swept away, in return for which the King was granted an hereditary excise of £100,000 a year on beer and other alcoholic beverages. Such acts and ordinances of the various Parliaments passed since 1642, as the Convention did not choose to confirm, were declared invalid; among those reënacted was the Navigation Act of 1651.

The Convention Makes no Provision for Religious Toleration. — The settlement of religion caused the greatest difficulty. Church affairs were in a most disordered and confused state. Within the Episcopalian and Presbyterian folds there were a number of moderates who desired a compromise, who would have welcomed a curtailment of the powers of the bishops and some modifications in the service. The Puritans, however, had been so destructive of beautiful old churches and their hallowed furnishings, so oppressive and unbending, as well, that the extreme Anglicans, naturally narrow and intolerant enough, were determined to allow them no concessions. Charles, nominally the head of the Church of England, was entirely without religious convictions, though he hated the Presbyterians and was inclined toward Roman Catholicism. In the Declaration he had promised to coöperate with Parliament in granting such liberty of conscience as would not disturb the peace of the Kingdom, a promise he was ready, even anxious, to carry out, because, under the guise of a general toleration of the sects, it would be possible to reintroduce Roman Catholicism. Nevertheless, as events showed, he was not ready to push this policy to the extent of risking his throne. Except for an Act to restore the ejected Episcopal clergy, the Convention passed no laws relating to religion. Fearing Charles's Roman

[1] This had reference to the late Act dealing with the regicides, which was called "An Act of Indemnity and Oblivion."

Catholic designs, the moderate Presbyterians lost a supreme chance by refusing to combine with the moderate Anglicans in passing a comprehension bill which he advocated, a bill broad enough in government and ceremonies to include both parties. In the forthcoming parliamentary election the reactionaries were in the majority. Dominant Anglicanism put down opposing sects with an uncompromising hand; but it was Parliament and not the Crown who directed the policy of repression.

The Restoration in Scotland. — The Restoration in Scotland was brought about by a Parliament which repealed all acts passed since 1639, reëstablished the Episcopal Church, and renounced the Covenant, which was burned by the common hangman. The Scots had chafed at the army of occupation and the dominance of the Independents, but they were soon to learn that the little finger of the new Government was thicker than the loins of the old. By the new Navigation Act, passed in 1660, they lost the equality of the trading privileges which they had recently enjoyed, and, by a subsequent measure, many of their commodities were excluded from England or burdened with heavy duties. All this, together with active persecution of the Covenanters, soon stirred up the old hostility between the two countries.

The Restoration in Ireland. — The Restoration in Ireland was equally fruitful in oppression and discontent. The King was under obligation to the Irish Catholics, he sympathized with their aims, and he "pitied the miserable condition of the Irish nation." But the Cromwellian settlers were in possession of the broad lands, and, backed by English anti-Catholic sentiment, were too strong to be displaced. All that Charles could do was to restore a few estates to the greater nobles and to procure a small amount of land for the lesser men. To make matters worse, heavy restrictions were imposed on Irish commerce. In 1663 their ships were excluded from the Colonial trade, and, three years later, the importation of Irish cattle into England was strictly forbidden.

The Opening of the Cavalier Parliament (8 May, 1661). — The new Parliament, which met 8 May, 1661, lasted till 1679, having a longer continuous existence than any other in English history. After the first outburst of loyalty was over, friction with the Crown began soon to develop. Having restored the King without the aid of foreign intervention, Parliament was determined to rule; many of the members resented the King's leaning toward Roman Catholicism and toleration for the sects and the exercise of the dispensing power which it involved; not a few were disquieted by his attempts to increase

the standing army and by his alliance with France, and looked askance at the royal profligacy and the splendor of the Court, not so much on moral grounds, as on account of the expenditures which they necessitated. Moreover, the country squires were discontented by falling rents, while the recent land settlement had satisfied neither the Puritan speculators nor the Cavaliers who had been forced to sell out.

The Corporation Act (1661). — Parliament at first showed its hot and masterful temper by passing a series of measures strengthening the power of the restored Monarchy. Then, with the aid of the Bishops now restored to their seats in the House of Lords, it proceeded to frame an ecclesiastical policy which, in most respects, ran directly counter to the intentions of Charles, and which resulted in transferring the control of Church affairs from the King to Parliament and the Bishops. This was accomplished mainly by a group of four Acts popularly known as the "Clarendon Code"[1] — though the Chancellor was by no means responsible for all of them — which excluded Dissenters from public office, from any share in the Establishment, and imposed other grave disabilities upon them. The Corporation Act, December, 1661, provided that no man could hold office in a corporate town unless he took the sacrament according to the Church of England, renounced the Covenant, and declared that it was unlawful, under any circumstances, to bear arms against the King.

The New Act of Uniformity (1662). — When Convocation produced a revision of the Prayer Book even more distasteful to the Puritans than its predecessors, Parliament accepted it, and 19 May, 1662, passed an Act of Uniformity providing that, on and after St. Bartholomew's Day,[2] the revised Book should be read in all the churches, and that all ministers who refused, or who had not received their holy orders by Episcopal ordination were to be deprived of their benefices. Schoolmasters also were required to conform to the Book, and both classes were further required to declare the illegality of taking up arms against the King. On the day appointed, nearly 2000 clergymen resigned their livings rather than sacrifice their convictions. Many of the most able men of the Kingdom, in order to maintain themselves and their wives and children, were forced to toil as laborers or to depend upon charity. The Act marks an epoch in English religious history. For nearly a century, the Nonconformists had sought to secure alterations in the government, doctrine, and

[1] They were: the Corporation Act, 1661; the Act of Uniformity, 1662; the Conventicle Act, 1664; and the Five Mile Act, 1665.

[2] St. Bartholomew's Day was 24 August.

ceremony of the Church and to remain within the fold; henceforth the majority sought to secure freedom of conscience outside. Separation rather than comprehension became their aim. Years of persecution, however, were to follow before they even partially effected their purpose.

The Conventicle Act, 1664, and the Five Mile Act, 1665. — Having defeated an attempt on the part of the King to soften the rigor of the Act and to introduce toleration by means of the dispensing power, Parliament proceeded with its ecclesiastical legislation. By the "Act against Seditious Conventicles," 1664, it was forbidden for five or more persons, exclusive of members of a family, to hold meetings for religious worship, where the Established forms were not used. The penalty was imprisonment for the first and second offenses, and transportation for the third. Persons who returned to the country were liable to be put to death. The Quakers seem to have been the chief sufferers. Pepys, who saw several dragged through the streets, noted in his diary: "I would to God they would conform, or be more wise and not be catched." In 1665 followed the equally cruel Five Mile Act, which provided that no Nonconformist minister was, for the future, to teach in any school, or to come within five miles of any city or corporate town unless he had taken an oath that it was unlawful to bear arms against the King, and had pledged himself that he would not "at any time endeavor the alteration of government in Church and State." This measure was peculiarly malevolent, because, during the Great Plague which visited London in this year, many of the regular clergy fled, leaving the dissenting ministers to care for the sick and dying. However, since the chief strength of Puritanism was in the towns, it was felt that it would be unusually dangerous to leave them a free hand at this time.

The Significance of the Clarendon Code. — These penal laws, mercilessly though somewhat intermittently enforced, sowed bitter seeds of hatred between the Dissenters and the governing authorities. Presbyterianism lost the preëminence it enjoyed during the early months of the Restoration, and even outside the Established Church ceased to play the leading rôle among the Protestant sects. Naturally democratic, the excluded bodies now became more so, partly out of increased resentment toward the aristocratic privileged classes, partly because those among them who were desirous of political influence hastened to conform, leaving only the extremists in the ranks. Dissent became more and more confined to the lower and middle classes. However, as time went on, numbers grew wealthy through trade and productive enterprise, and combined with

the more liberal Anglicans to demand toleration and other progressive measures.

Charles' Foreign Policy. The Portuguese Marriage, and the Approach to France. — In his foreign relations as in his ecclesiastical aims Charles developed a policy quite at variance with Parliament and with Clarendon. Ready to attach himself to the highest bidder, he turned first to the thrifty Dutch, who seemed to offer the best prospects for a loan; but the passage of the Navigation Act destroyed any chance of help from that quarter. Next, he looked about for a bride, and finally negotiated a treaty with the King of Portugal for a marriage with his sister Catharine of Braganza. By this alliance and the accompanying dowry, England obtained Tangier,[1] Bombay, 2,000,000 crusados in money, together with commercial privileges and freedom of conscience for English merchants. The bride's failure to bear the King a male heir brought about a bitter struggle toward the close of his reign, yet, in spite of neglecting her shamefully, he loyally resisted the strong pressure which was brought upon him to divorce her.

Very early in his reign Charles adopted the policy of a close alliance with France, which he maintained, except for brief intervals, till his death. While his chief motive was to secure French subsidies, other reasons were not without weight: particularly he was desirous of extending English trade, and counted on French aid in breaking the colonial monopoly which Spain still retained and in humbling the Dutch, the greatest sea power of the time. This policy of uniting with England's ancient enemy, to be sure, had originated with Cromwell; but he would never have tolerated Louis's Catholic aggressions, to which for some years Charles lent his favor; moreover, he would have dominated the alliance instead of playing the part of a subordinate pensionary.

The Second Dutch War (1665–1667). — The commercial greatness of England which Charles sought to foster was bound to arouse the hostility of the Dutch. Furthermore, there still existed many outstanding points of friction. For example, the English Court hated the Republican faction which had obtained control in the United Provinces, while the trading companies of the two countries were constantly fighting; the Dutch refused compensation for certain English ships which they had seized, nor would they restore one of the East India Spice Islands awarded to England in 1654. Among the acts which precipitated the crisis, was Colonel Nicoll's seizure, in May, 1664, of New Netherland, which Charles had granted to his

[1] It was abandoned to the Moors in 1684.

brother, the Duke of York, over a year previously. The Dutch replied with one reprisal after another, until war was finally declared, 4 March, 1665. If the professions of the King may be believed, he was pushed into hostilities by public opinion and the eagerness of his brother.

The Sad State of the English Navy. — It is possible that Charles, while desiring to fight at a fitting opportunity, may have desired delay owing to the ill-prepared state of the navy, which at any rate was soon manifest. Even if the system of administration was not as bad as has sometimes been represented, nevertheless many of the officials were idle and corrupt, and, owing to the poor food and uncertain pay, sailors were so reluctant to enlist that it was necessary to resort freely to impressment. As a result, the crews were most unruly and so discontented that many who were taken prisoners by the Dutch entered the service of their captors. Much was subsequently done by Charles and James to improve the state of the navy; for they were both keenly interested, and had an efficient and devoted servant in Samuel Pepys; but it did not come in time for the second Dutch war.

The Opening Events of the War (1665). — The primary object of each combatant was to protect its own shipping and to inflict all possible damage on the shipping of the enemy, for neither side had a sufficient army to effect anything by land. In the first serious encounter which occurred, 3 June, 1665, off Lowestoft,[1] the Duke of York gained a decisive victory for the English, though the Dutch, after being put to flight, managed to regain their own shores in safety. While the English had proved their superiority in fighting, the events of the remainder of the year counterbalanced their signal success. Shortage of men and supplies and the last and one of the worst visitations of the Plague, which raged in London during the summer, all helped to account for this. Charles, in the meantime, had allied himself with the warlike Bishop of Münster, who invaded the Dutch frontier in September, a gain that was more than offset by the entrance of Louis XIV into the war on the side of the Dutch, in January, 1666.

The Fighting in 1666. — Louis's intervention and the possibility of a French attack frightened the English into dividing their fleet, with the result that Monck [2] was roughly handled by a superior force under De Ruyter in the Four Days' Battle, 1–4 June, 1666, fought between North Foreland and Dunkirk. Monck and Prince Rupert, in their turn, defeated De Ruyter off North Foreland, 25–27 July, after which they chased the Dutch home, ravaged their coast, de-

[1] Sometimes called the Battle of Solebay.

[2] Created Duke of Albemarle at the Restoration.

stroyed towns, and capture much shipping. Lack of provisions, which kept the English from remaining continuously at sea, and storms, prevented further naval engagements. Moreover, the Bishop of Münster having made peace in April, the land operations ceased as well. By autumn, both sides were ready for peace: the Dutch because they wanted a free hand to resist the encroachments of Louis XIV, who had only aided them in order to keep the combatants evenly balanced while he sought to secure Spanish lands on the Netherland border which he claimed in right of his wife; the English because they could not longer stand the expense, particularly since the Plague in London had been followed by a disastrous fire.

The Peace of Breda (27 July, 1667). — With peace in sight, Charles was unwilling to spend money on strengthening and refitting the fleet, and so threw away such advantages as had been gained. Profiting by this inaction, De Ruyter entered the mouth of the Thames, passed up the Medway and took, burned, and scuttled sixteen vessels, inflicting a loss that was great and a shame that was immeasurable. Fortunately the Dutch did not feel strong enough to remain, so they withdrew to the mouth of the Thames, where they occupied themselves for a time intercepting commerce. Before they could do any more damage the local forces were called out, and the coast and ports put in a state of defense. Peace was concluded at Breda, 21 July, 1667. Fearing the designs of Louis XIV, the Dutch agreed to comparatively favorable terms. In their chief concession — to leave New Netherland in the hands of the English — they yielded more than they realized, for this territory included the present New York, New Jersey, and Delaware.

The Plague, the Fire (1665–1666). — England emerged from the struggle in an extremely crippled condition. The Plague, in the summer and autumn of 1665, carried off 70,000 from London alone, and, during the following spring, spread through the southern and eastern counties. It was the first visitation for over thirty years and proved to be the last. The great London fire which followed, raged for five days, 2–7 September, 1666, during which interval it is estimated that at least two thirds of the population were unroofed. In rebuilding the City, the streets were made broader and straighter, and the houses with their overhanging upper stories, which cut off the air and sunshine, disappeared. A newer London arose, less picturesque, but more healthful and spacious than the old.

The Growing Discontent, and the Attack on Clarendon (1667). — The three disasters — the Plague, the Fire, and Dutch in the Medway — were regarded as signs of Divine wrath at the corruption and inefficiency of the Government. Among the credulous lower and

middle classes, the Fire was attributed to the machinations of the "Papists" and the French, who were thought to have caused it by throwing "fire-balls" into the City; it was expected that a general massacre would follow, and Catholics and Frenchmen were mobbed in the streets. In general the situation was gloomy enough, what with a lazy dissipated King, a dearth of money, and "no reputation at home and abroad." The first victim of the vague but intense and increasing discontent was Clarendon. Charles, anxious to be rid of him, was glad to make him the scapegoat. Men of all classes looked with envy to the lofty height to which he had risen, and longed to see him overthrown, while many, indeed, nourished actual grievances against him. He was blamed, with scant justice, for the sale of Dunkirk to France in 1662, and for the disasters of the late war which he had opposed. The country gentry hated him for opposing the Irish Cattle Act, and the Dissenters were infuriated against him as the reputed author of the cruel "Code" directed against them. His austere ideals were a constant reproach to Charles and the more dissolute and frivolous courtiers, while his old-fashioned and pompous bearing offered them endless opportunity for raillery. His chief difficulty, however, was his attempt to hold an untenable ground between the Crown and Parliament. While Charles was anxious to be quit of him on less worthy grounds, it is only fair to say that he had come to realize it was futile to attempt to retain a Minister to whom Parliament was so unalterably opposed.

His Impeachment and Flight. — In August, 1667, the faithful old servant was dismissed from his office of Chancellor; in November the Commons presented articles of impeachment against the fallen Minister, charging him among other things, with corruption, with intent to introduce arbitrary government, and with treachery during the late war. While these extreme charges were unjust, there were many serious counts against the Chancellor, besides the fact that he was out of harmony with the attempt of Parliament to supervise the administration. In the summer of 1667 he had advised the King to delay calling Parliament, and in the meantime, to raise supplies on his own authority; he had arbitrarily imprisoned the opponents of the Government; and he has been accused of first teaching Charles to seek money from France. On the King's advice he fled to the Continent. He died at Rouen in 1674.

Parliamentary Gains in the Control of Finances. — The financial situation continued to be very disturbing. The moneys granted proved insufficient to meet expenses. Cries were raised of corruption in high places, and the King was accused of diverting huge sums for

his private pleasures. While he was extravagant enough, the root of the trouble lay deeper: supplies were voted so tardily and collected so grudgingly that the Government was obliged to anticipate by borrowing; and the prevailing high rate of interest cut into revenues that at best were hardly adequate even for legitimate expenses. Niggardly as the Commons were, they were wise in keeping a tight hold on the purse-strings, and made notable gains during the Clarendonian régime. In a grant, made in 1665, a clause was inserted that the moneys voted should be used only for the purposes of the war. Suggested by a wily royal adviser to prevent the goldsmiths from claiming any portion for debts due to them, this marks another important step toward the practice of appropriation of supplies. Two years later, in the spring of 1667, after a sharp and prolonged struggle, the King made the important concession of appointing a committee of Parliament to audit accounts. One issue raised in this period was settled, 3 July, 1678, when the Commons carried a resolution that all bills of supply should originate in their House, and that such bills "ought not to be changed or altered by the House of Lords." From that date the Lords have never made a serious attempt to originate or amend a money bill. In spite, however, of these evidences of the growing strength of the Commons, Charles, directly his old mentor was disposed of, proceeded to collect about him a body of Ministers of his own choice and to develop a policy quite at variance with Parliament's, a policy which he struggled for some years to maintain.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

Narrative. Besides Trevelyan, Ranke, Lingard, and *Cambridge Modern History* already cited, Richard Lodge, *The Political History of England*, 1660–1702 (1910). Macaulay, *History of England* (illus. ed. C. B. Firth, 6 vols., 1914) gives a brief survey of the reign.

Constitutional. In addition to Taylor, Taswell-Langmead and Hallam, A. Amos, *The English Constitution in the Reign of Charles II* (1857) and W. C. Abbott, "Long Parliament of Charles II," *English Historical Review* (January–April, 1906).

Contemporary. Samuel Pepys's *Diary* (most complete ed. H. B. Wheatley, 9 vols., 1893–1899). Evelyn, *Diary*. G. Burnet, *The History of My Own Time* (ed. O. Airy, the reign of Charles II, 2 vols., 1897–1900) in spite of some partisanship and inaccuracies, an indispensable authority.

Biography. O. Airy, *Charles II* (1901), an admirable biography and a good survey of the reign. Violet Barbour, *Henry Bennet, Earl of Arlington* (1914). A. Browning, *Thomas Osborne, Earl of Danby and Duke of Leeds* (1913). Lady Burghclere, *George Villiers, Second Duke of Buckingham*

(1903). W. D. Christie, *Life of the First Earl of Shaftesbury* (2 vols., 1871), a scholarly vindication. H. D. Traill, *Shaftesbury* (1888), a brief sketch. T. H. Lister, *Life of Edward, First Earl of Clarendon* (3 vols., 1838); has not been superseded by the recent *Life* by Sir Henry Craik (2 vols., 1911). A. C. Ewald, *Life and Times of Algernon Sidney* (2 vols., 1873). Helen C Foxcroft, *Life and Letters of George Savile, First Marquis of Halifax* (2 vols., 1898). Foxcroft and Clarke, *Life of Gilbert Burnet* (1907). A. Fea, *King Monmouth* (1902). H. B. Irving, *Life of Lord Jeffreys* (1898), an apology. Roger North, *The Lives of the Norths* (ed. A. Jessopp, 3 vols., 1890), a classic.

Special. G. B. Hertz, *English Public Opinion after the Restoration* (1902). C. B. R. Kent, *The Early History of the Tories* (1908). Seeley, *British Policy*. A. T. Mahan, *The Influence of Sea Power on History*, 1660–1783 (15th ed., 1898), an epoch-making work. A. W. Tedder, *The Navy of the Restoration* (1916), an excellent study.

Church. Hutton; Wakeman; and Stoughton.

Scotland and Ireland. Works already cited. For further reading on Scotland and Ireland see Lodge, 487–471. *Cambridge Modern History*, V, 825–837.

Selections from the sources. Adams and Stephens, nos. 221–226. C. G. Robertson, *Select Statutes, Cases and Documents* (1904), pt. I, nos. I–IX; pt. II, no. I.

CHAPTER XXXIII

FROM THE FALL OF CLARENDON TO THE DEATH OF CHARLES II (1667–1685)

Charles Seeks to Make Himself Absolute (1667). — Charles took advantage of the fall of Clarendon to carry out a design which he had been cherishing for years — to establish himself as an absolute Monarch. To that end, he applied himself with renewed energy to the four means by which he sought to accomplish his purpose: to building up the standing army; attaching the Dissenters by offering the toleration which Parliament refused to grant; restoring Roman Catholicism; and securing a closer alliance with the French King, to whom he looked for supplies, and, in case of need, for troops. The obstacles, however, proved so formidable that he had to follow a very crooked course, and, before many years had passed, to alter his plans profoundly. In sensing the situation at the proper moment and in the means which he adopted to meet it, the King, who appeared to most of his subjects as a good-natured and witty trifler, proved himself to be one of the most cunning politicians of the century.

The "Cabal" (1667–1673). — In the meantime, until the turning point of his policy, in 1673, he governed with a body of intimate councilors known as the "Cabal." It formed an inner circle of the Privy Council, and its members, who were consulted by the King singly or collectively, or in groups of two or three, were responsible to him and not to Parliament. While such Cabals, even under that name, were not unknown in English history long before the body in question came into existence, some have derived the word from the initial letters of the names of its leading members — Clifford, Ashley, Buckingham, Arlington and Lauderdale.[1] Ablest of them all was Anthony Ashley Cooper, who served as Chancellor of the Exchequer from 1661 to 1672, when he was created Lord Chancellor and Earl of Shaftes-

[1] In reality it is derived from a Hebrew word *cabala*, which meant a "secret," hence it came to be applied to a party or faction engaged in a secret design, and later, to a group of secret councilors. Charles's body, however, is the most famous of them all.

bury. He was a born agitator and demagogue, a forerunner of the modern party leader; yet, with all his ambition and his turnings against men and parties, he was ever consistent in the pursuit of his two ideals — civil liberty and toleration for all Protestants. He was himself a freethinker. The Duke of Buckingham was a man of engaging manners and not without accomplishments, but was vain, unsteady, and ever striving for powers in the State which he was incapable of using. Though he espoused the cause of the Dissenters for a time, he was not only devoid of religious opinions but a libertine to boot, perhaps the worst of all the dissolute set who surrounded the King. Lauderdale was a former Covenanter who devoted himself chiefly to Scotch affairs with the design of making the Crown supreme in that country. While Charles used all these men in the development of far reaching plans which, if they had been carried to completion, would have destroyed Protestantism and popular liberty in England, the "Cabal," as such, never enjoyed his full confidence, to say nothing of dominating him as Clarendon had done.

The Secret Treaty of Dover (1670). — The English were embittered at the French King for taking the Dutch side in the late war, and apprehensive of his growing power as well. Nevertheless, Charles soon came to terms with Louis XIV; for, to his mind, the French alliance was closely bound up with the introduction of Roman Catholicism and the revival of the old monarchial power. In pursuance of this design, the famous Treaty of Dover was concluded with France, 22 May, 1670. Only two of the Cabal were present, and the terms long remained a secret. They were, in substance: that Charles, in return for an annual grant during the period of hostilities, agreed to join Louis in making war on the Dutch, and to assist him in securing the inheritance which he claimed — through his wife, a daughter of Philip IV of Spain — in the Spanish Netherlands. Furthermore, and this was the secret part, the English King, in consideration of a sum of money, was, at a fitting time, to declare himself a Roman Catholic, and in case Charles's subjects resisted, Louis was to send troops to aid him. Though Charles was inclined to declare his conversion forthwith, the French ambassador persuaded him that such a step would strengthen the hands of the Dutch as champions of Protestantism, whereas, if the English were kept in ignorance of their Sovereign's change of faith they would continue to regard them merely as trade rivals. So, of the two objects contemplated in the Treaty, that of the destruction of the Dutch was thrust into the foreground. Since the negotiations leading up to the secret Treaty were known to all the Ministers, Charles commissioned Buckingham to negotiate a sham

treaty, concluded in February, 1671, which was practically the same as that of the previous spring except for the provision concerning religion. Meantime, Charles by nursing Parliament in the delusion that a Triple Alliance — concluded with the Dutch and Swedes in 1667 — still held, secured large sums for the purpose of rendering it effective. Had he stood loyally by the Dutch, the designs of Louis XIV might have been checked and later costly and devastating wars might have been avoided.

The Declaration of Indulgence (1672–1673). — The religious situation was such as to cause "all Protestant hearts to tremble." On 15 March, 1672, the King issued a Declaration of Indulgence, suspending "all manner of penal laws in matters ecclesiastical against whatsoever sort of Nonconformists or recusants." Although the Declaration only granted to Catholics liberty of private worship, while all Protestant sects were to be allowed to worship in public, men suspected it was issued mainly in the Catholic interest. Nor did it allay the suspicions, particularly of the Presbyterians, when the jails were opened and hundreds of Quakers and other Dissenters were released, although a large body of the Nonconformists sent the King a deputation to express their gratitude. When Parliament met, in February, 1673, the opposition was so intense, that Charles, in return for a grant of money which he sorely needed, announced, 8 March, that he would cancel the Declaration.

The Test Act and the Break-up of the Cabal (1673). — To clinch their victory, Parliament passed the famous Test Act providing that all holders of civil and military office must receive the sacrament according to the Church of England and take an oath declaring their disbelief in transubstantiation. That test excluded Roman Catholics and conscientious Dissenters for over a century and a half.[1] The immediate result of the Test Act was the break-up of the Cabal Ministry, though Arlington and Buckingham managed to hold on till 1674, and Lauderdale till 1680. Shaftesbury, the lifelong friend of religious liberty, who had been one of the instigators of the Declaration, but who, on gaining an inkling of the real purport of the Treaty of Dover and the King's Catholic designs, had reversed his policy and had lent his support to the Test Act, was dismissed from the office of Lord Chancellor, and became the most active leader and organizer of the opposition party forming against the Court. The anti-Catholic party had renewed cause for apprehension when the King's brother James, Duke of York, whose first wife, Anne Hyde, had died the previous year, married, in the autumn of 1673, Mary of Modena, who had been

[1] Some Nonconformists did not scruple to qualify by taking the sacrament.

destined for a nun. The nuptials were brought about in the teeth of a Parliamentary address, praying that the Duke should not wed any person but of the Protestant religion.

The Third Dutch War (1672–1674). — Parliament shared also in the growing opposition to the Dutch War which had resulted from the Treaty of Dover, and which was now drawing to a close. At the outset the war had been popular, for the English, as yet unaware of Charles's Catholic designs, welcomed the chance of French aid to crush their commercial rivals and avenge the invasion of the Medway. While the two countries were still at peace and while De Witt, the Grand Pensionary, was making every effort to avert a conflict, Charles ordered an attack on a Dutch fleet from Smyrna as it passed up the Channel. This inexcusable act of bad faith, which deservedly failed, led to a declaration of war four days later, 17 March, 1672. The situation seemed very serious for the Dutch. In the previous war the English victories at sea had been barren of results, because of their inability to follow them up by land attacks. Now with the armies of Louis operating on the frontier, they had every prospect of crushing their opponents. Neither side, however, was well prepared, and the first battle off Southwold Bay,[1] 28 May, 1672, was indecisive. An attempt made by the allies, later in the season, to land on the Dutch coast was frustrated by the Dutch Admiral, with the help of his superior knowledge of the foggy, sandy shores.

The Close of the War. — The next year, Prince Rupert succeeded the Duke of York, who had to give up his command in consequence of the Test Act. Several engagements proved as indecisive as that off Solebay. The feeling between the French and English in the allied fleets became intense. Increasing numbers of Englishmen, who had already begun to fear the designs of Louis XIV more than the commercial rivalry of the Dutch, became convinced that their sailors were being used to fight the battles of the French, and it was the common opinion in London that "unless this alliance with France be broken the nation will be ruined." Since the Dutch were torn by party strife, both sides were ready to come to terms. So a treaty was signed at London, 9 February, 1674,[2] by which the Dutch again acknowledged the honor of the flag and restored New York which they had captured in the previous July.

The Turning Point in the Policy of Charles. Danby made Lord Treasurer. — With the passage of the Test Act and the close of the Third Dutch War, Charles quietly dropped his design of making England Catholic. Sir Thomas Osborne (1631–1712) succeeded Clifford

[1] Or Solebay.

[2] Known as the Peace of Westminster.

as Lord Treasurer, in 1673, and was created Earl of Danby the following year. A devoted supporter of the royal prerogative, he was opposed to Dissenters, to Catholicism and French ascendancy, and showed great financial ability, though he was unscrupulous in filling his own pockets and in attaching supporters by bribery and patronage. While he was not the first to employ financial corruption in Parliament, he organized the system and extended it to the rank and file. Working with Danby, Charles readily went to the lengths of deserting the Catholics for the High Anglicans, and of consenting to the persecution of the Nonconformists; nevertheless, except for brief intervals, he continued in the pay of France till his death, though, after the peace with the Dutch, he never gave Louis any active support, receiving his subsidies in return for neutrality.

The Beginning of the Modern Party System. — It was during the fight against Danby and the Court policy, in the session of 1675, that the Country Party, which had been taking shape for some years, was definitely organized under Shaftesbury in the Lords and by William Sacheverell in the Commons. Built on the principles of parliamentary supremacy and toleration, it soon came to be known as the Whig Party, a name which it bore until well into the nineteenth century. It survives to-day in the present Liberal Party. While Danby was the first to organize a Government machine, his opponents put on a permanent footing one of the two great modern political parties. The center of activity of the Country Party was the Green Ribbon Club, founded in 1675, and, during the next few years a very busy organization it was, spurred by the feverish energy of its president, Shaftesbury. Anti-government men of all sorts gathered at its meetings, there petitions were drawn up, and thence speakers, agents and pamphlets were sent to spread their views throughout the city and country.

The Succession. The Marriage of William of Orange and Princess Mary, 1677. — The question of the succession was gradually becoming acute. In 1676, James, Duke of York, brother and heir of the King, became a professed Roman Catholic, whereupon there began a famous struggle, which came to a head two or three years later, to exclude him from the throne. The Protestant interest scored a victory when the King, in spite of the fact that he was in the pay of France, agreed, on zealous pressure from Danby, that Mary,[1] the eldest daughter of James and his first wife Anne Hyde, should marry William of Orange. The marriage, which had already been discussed in 1674, was celebrated 4 November, 1677. Charles's motives were: to force more money from

[1] She had been brought up a Protestant, though her mother died in the Church of Rome.

Louis by coquetting with his enemy, as he had once before at the time of the Triple Alliance; to strengthen himself with his Anglican supporters; and to obtain from Parliament supplies of money and men by a threatened demonstration against the Power which they hated.

A Tortuous Foreign Policy. — The course of English foreign policy and the relations between Charles and his Parliament were most tortuous and complicated. At times the King, in order to strengthen his army and to secure supplies from the Commons, was threatening war with France; yet, all the while, he was treating with his old paymaster, now breathing defiance, now promising to dissolve his Parliament, always with the view of making the best financial terms possible. While Parliament voted him considerable sums to help James' Dutch son-in-law against the encroachments of Louis XIV, there was generally a strong opposition against him. Many, and not without reason, distrusted Charles's sincerity, fearing the use to which he might put the men and money which he sought, others wanted to get rid of Danby, and, sad to say, not a few had been corrupted by French gold. The aim of Louis XIV in subsidizing the Opposition [1] was to strengthen the party opposed to Danby, and, while the session lasted, to keep Charles so embroiled that he could not carry out his threat of intervening in behalf of the Dutch. When, in spite of his bribes and intrigues, the English King finally prepared to send a force to assist William of Orange, Louis was obliged to sign a peace with the Dutch at Nymwegen, 10 August, 1678. While Charles gained nothing by the actual terms of the peace, the events which led up to it had greatly strengthened his position. He had increased his standing army and he had drawn large sums of money both from Parliament and Louis, by playing one against the other.

Titus Oates and the "Popish Plot." — Such was the situation when startling disclosures of Titus Oates, an unscrupulous informer and liar, threw England into a violent panic. The anti-Catholic frenzy aroused by the so-called "Popish Plot" gave the Country Party a momentary ascendancy which they failed to maintain because of their unbridled violence. Titus Oates was the son of a Baptist formerly a chaplain of one of Cromwell's regiments. Deserting his father's faith he had first taken orders in the Church of England, and then, in 1677, joined the Church of Rome. His motives were base: either to obtain profitable employment as an agent in Catholic intrigues, or to sell their secrets to the English Protestant party. Already, in the course of a checkered career, he had been found guilty of false witness

[1] It was estimated at one time that more than two thirds of the members were in the pay either of Charles or Louis.

and of offenses even more loathsome. During brief residences at two Jesuit colleges abroad, from each of which he was successively expelled, he learned, through scraps of conversation, that Charles II was thought to stand in the way of the Romanist conversion of England for which he had once striven so zealously; that Catholic hopes were now centered on his royal brother; that Coleman, secretary first of the Duke and later of the Duchess of York, was busy corresponding with the French Jesuit, Père la Chaise, and that a Jesuit congregation had been held in London in April. Thus scantily equipped he went to London, where he worked up his story from such raw materials as he had gathered. It was, in substance, that there was a hellish plot to fire the City, to rouse rebellion in Ireland, to invade England with a French and Irish army, to massacre the Protestants, and to murder the King.

The Murder of Sir Edmund Bury Godfrey (1678). — These disclosures were read before Charles and the Council, and a copy of the charges was put in the hands of Sir Edmund Bury Godfrey, a justice of the peace, who, though a Protestant, was intimately acquainted with Coleman and other prominent Roman Catholics. In spite of the fact that Oates was twice caught in falsehood and contradiction during his examination before the Council, an investigation was set on foot which resulted in the discovery of Coleman's correspondence with Père la Chaise. This was the only evidence that could be found to support the story of Oates. In view, however, of the intrigues with France, partly known and partly suspected, the people were ready to believe anything; in consequence, when, 17 October, 1678, the dead body of Sir Edmund Bury Godfrey was found in a ditch, north of London, their fears mounted to a panic. The mystery of Godfrey's death has never been solved.

Causes Promoting Belief in the Plot. — A review of the years immediately preceding will show that Oates, though he told a lying story, had some ground to work upon; in other words, that there was to some extent a real as well as a sham plot. Charles, by the Treaty of Dover, had entered into a definite engagement for the Catholicizing of England. When the turn of events caused him to abandon these designs, and particularly after he had given his sanction to the marriage of William of Orange and had allied himself to the Dutch, Catholics at home and abroad, far from giving up hope, began to look to his brother to accomplish the work which he had deserted. While they worked earnestly at their plan of converting the country and to secure the succession of James, there is no proof that they ever plotted to murder the reigning King. Though party leaders on both sides sought

to make use of the "Plot" for their own ends, Shaftesbury was the most active of all in fomenting the excitement. Oates gave him the weapons he sought, to fight the succession of James and the Catholic line. His zeal was amazing in procuring informers and in hounding them by threats or bribery or whatever means proved most effective. Sad to say, all too many, high in public affairs, were deluded or unscrupulous enough to fan the flames of popular frenzy.

Charles's Share in the Responsibility. — Charles must bear a heavy share in the responsibility for the whole matter. By his manifest favor to Catholics in the early part of the reign and by his intrigues with France, he had placed himself in a position such that he could not make light of the whole affair without laying himself open to suspicion. So, though he did not believe a word of the Plot and even declared to his intimates that he regarded the chief informers as liars and rogues, he remained passive, letting events take their course. He suffered innocent men to go to their death on the testimony of rascals, and even permitted Oates, the arch-villain of them all, to lodge in splendor at Whitehall and to receive a large weekly pension from the privy purse. Finally, when he came to realize that Shaftesbury and his party were aiming, with the aid of Oates and his kind, to force him to divorce his Queen and to exclude his brother from the throne, he roused himself, dashed their plans and fought them with amazing ability and determination during the rest of his reign. Yet, before that happened, he had allowed his subjects, whom his father had once described as a "sober people," to pass through a stage of madness which was an abiding disgrace to him and to them.

Parliament Imposes New Tests upon Roman Catholics (1678). — Parliament met 21 October, 1678, and continued in session till 30 December. Its first step was to hurry through a resolution that "there has been and still is, a damnable and hellish plot contrived and carried on by Popish recusants, for the assassinating and murdering of the King, and for subverting the Government, and rooting out and destroying the Protestant religion." None dared dissent, for fear of being thought implicated. Fear rose to panic. Elaborate precautions were taken against fire, men went about armed, and the Protestant "flail" was invented, a handy little club for striking suddenly a threatened assailant. The City and the royal palace were guarded with troops and cannon. The prisons were filled with suspects, and, while their trials were proceeding, measures were framed to exclude Catholics from the Government. A new test, passed 28 October, obliged members of both Houses to take the oaths of Supremacy and Allegiance and subscribe to a declaration that worship according to the Church

of Rome was idolatrous. One commendable achievement of this session was in forcing Charles to disband the standing army which the Commons protested was raised "for an imaginary war."

The Victims of the Plot. — For months the trials of those accused of participation in the Plot went on. Coleman was the first to die, and upwards of twenty more met the same fate; most of them guiltless of any crime except that of being Roman Catholics and attempting to propagate their faith. The judges were brutal and biased, the witnesses told what they knew to be lies, but, it must be said, the procedure was no more unfair than it had been for a century and more. In constant fear of danger from without, of treason and rebellion from within, with no adequate police or military force, the Government saw no safety except in swift ruthless convictions. Thus the law courts were concerned not so much in saving the innocent as in making examples of those who seemed guilty. While the Popish terror was at its height, the courts as well as the places of execution were threatened by howling mobs, so that the judges could acquit no one without the greatest risk to their own safety. The turn of the tide came in July, 1679, when the Chief Justice, acting on a hint from the Crown, withstood popular clamor and declared the acquittal of the Queen's physician, whose case was bound up with that of his royal mistress. More trials there were; but they grew fewer and fewer, though two victims of high rank remained yet to be sacrificed to the popular fury. In December, 1680, Lord Stafford, an aged peer of the notable family of Howard, was sent to the block, and, in the ensuing summer, he was followed by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Armagh, the last of the accused to suffer.

The Fall of Danby (1678–1679). — Meantime, Danby had fallen and the Cavalier Parliament was no more. The Lord Treasurer was overthrown by the combined hostility of the Shaftesbury party and the French King. The agent was a disappointed office-seeker, who, moved by revenge and a bribe from Louis XIV, disclosed instructions which he had received from Danby to offer the dissolution of Parliament in return for a French loan. Parliament started to impeach the Lord Treasurer forthwith. It was urged in vain that, disapproving of the proposal, he acted solely in accordance with the royal orders. Next, Charles tried to save him by proroguing and then dissolving Parliament. The new Parliament, which met 6 March, 1679, resumed the attack. Ultimately the impeachment was withdrawn, he was convicted under a bill of attainder and committed to the Tower, where he remained for nearly five years. Danby's case is of great political and constitutional significance; it marks another step in

the process of calling Ministers to account, and established the principle that a royal pardon was no bar to an impeachment.

The "Habeas Corpus Act" (1679). — This Parliament which disposed of Danby secured notable gains to the subject in connection with the writ of Habeas Corpus. Notwithstanding the Petition of Right, repeated instances of arbitrary imprisonment occurred after the Restoration. One bill after another was introduced, but it was not till 1679 that an Act was passed, mainly through the efforts of Shaftesbury, to make the execution of the writ more effectual. Hitherto, the jailer had not been bound to make an immediate return, and he might avoid giving up a prisoner by shifting him from prison to prison. Moreover, it was not clear whether any but the Court of King's Bench could issue the writ, or whether a single judge could do so during the long vacation. The Act of 1679 provided that any prisoner held for a criminal charge must, on the issuance of the writ, be brought before the judge within a specified time to decide whether he should be discharged, released on bail, or held for trial. Henceforth, the writ might be obtained from any court, while, during the long vacation, a single judge might issue it. Furthermore, except in special cases, persons could not be imprisoned beyond the seas, and the writ was to run in the counties palatine and other privileged jurisdictions. Evasions were punished by heavy fines. Even yet the remedies were still inadequate. A judge might require bail too excessive for the prisoner to obtain, jailers might make a false return, and the provisions applied to criminal cases only. The first abuse was remedied by the Bill of Rights, the two latter by an act of 1816.

The First Exclusion Bill (1679). The Whigs and Tories. — Charles ratified the Act in order to placate the Opposition, who were bent on excluding the Duke of York from the succession. A bill for that purpose passed the Commons, and he only prevented it from going to the Lords by proroguing Parliament, 27 May, 1679. That body did not meet again till the autumn of 1680. During the interval the struggle raged furiously. In general, Charles played a waiting game, hoping by repeated prorogations to keep Parliament in check or to drive the Opposition to violence. Petitions poured in from all parts of the country, begging him to call Parliament. These were answered by counter-petitions from his supporters, declaring their abhorrence of such petitions. The names "petitioners" and "abhorrers" came to be applied to the two great parties, who, however, soon received their more enduring names of "Whigs and Tories."[1]

[1] "Whig" is thought to be a shortened form of "Whiggamore," a name applied to the Scotch covenanting party, from "Whiggam," the cry by which they en-

The Second Exclusion Bill (1680). The Oxford Parliament (1681). — Truly these months were a "crazy time everywhere." The Duke of Monmouth, one of Charles's natural sons, a weak, erring young man as charming in manners as his reputed father, had gained some popularity by suppressing a Presbyterian rising in Scotland, and Shaftesbury, disappointed of forcing Charles into a divorce and a Protestant marriage, aimed to prove that Monmouth was the legitimate fruit of a secret marriage, and thus to set him in place of the Duke of York as heir to the throne. When Parliament met, in October, a second Exclusion Bill was introduced. Passing the Commons, it was defeated, chiefly by the eloquence of Lord Halifax, who favored Charles's plan of a Catholic succession with limitations, whereupon, the Houses were prorogued, and finally dissolved, in January, 1681. The King's last Parliament met 21 March, 1681, at Oxford; for he dared not allow it to assemble in London. The Whigs, greatly in the majority and backed by bands of armed followers, were determined to force through their exclusion measure, and to set up a Protestant Association to govern the country under Monmouth. Charles, in order to secure his supporters against attack, had the road to Oxford lined with armed men and made other preparations for defense. Moreover, he secured another large grant from Louis, and, when the Opposition again refused to accept a bill of limitations, he put an end to the session after eight days, the members dispersing with "dreadful faces and loud sighs." Charles's waiting policy had been crowned with success, the Whigs had over-reached themselves by their own violence, and never again, while he lived, were they to recover their lost ascendancy. Their leaders kept up the struggle, but their following was a body of desperate agitators, not a popular political party.

Flight and Death of Shaftesbury. The Royal Attack on the Municipal Corporations. — Loyal addresses came pouring in from all sides, couched in the most abject and fulsome language. The Tory doctrines of non-resistance and absolute devotion to absolutism now became all the more fashionable by way of reaction against the Whig notions which had dominated the last three Parliaments. Charles was now ready to assume the aggressive. The first blow was aimed against Shaftesbury, who was charged with plotting against the King and with attempting to set up a republic. Although the grand jury refused to bring in a true bill against him, the fiery popular leader, after a year of furious agitation and busy intrigues, fled to Holland in December, 1682,

couraged their horses, though some derive it from a word meaning "sour whey." "Tory" originally meant an Irish outlaw. It was first applied by Oates to those who disbelieved in the Plot, and passed from them to the opponents of the Exclusion.

where he died the following January. The Middlesex jury who had thus defied the royal will was appointed by the London sheriffs who, in their turn, were chosen by the City, where the Whig element remained strong. Accordingly, Charles, in order to revenge himself and at the same time to gain control of the government of London, had a writ of *quo warranto* brought in the King's Bench calling on the City to show why — by what warrant — it should not forfeit its charter, on the pretext that it had abused its privileges. In June, 1683, the judges rendered a decision that the charter should be forfeited. Nevertheless, it was proposed that the charter might be retained on certain conditions, the most important being that the election of the chief officials should be submitted for royal approval. When the City refused to submit to this arrangement, Charles proceeded to appoint men of his own choice. He next extended the attack against other municipalities. His object was not only to increase his supporters in influential centers, but, since many corporations chose the parliamentary members from their borough, to strengthen his party in the House of Commons in the event of another session. Some resisted, some surrendered voluntarily when suit was brought against them; altogether, nearly seventy charters were forfeited or remodeled. Meantime, the Duke of York had resumed office in violation of the Test Act, and the persecution of Dissenters had been resumed.

The Triumph and Death of Charles (1685). — Charles was now triumphant. The country was prosperous and trade was flourishing; the furious partisanship of the Whigs, the dread of another revolution, and the King's adroitness in giving up his Catholic designs and in playing his adversaries until they had risen to the bait had left him supreme. Yet he had won at a tremendous sacrifice. For the sake of French gold he had acquiesced tamely in Louis XIV's plans of ascendancy, which caused untold misery to generations to come. Happily he did not live to enjoy long the repose which he had so basely gained. He was stricken with apoplexy, 2 February, 1685, and only survived four days. Witty to the last, he apologized to those about him for being "such an unconscionable time in dying." In his last hours he was received into the Church of Rome.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

Narrative. Lodge; Trevelyan; *Cambridge Modern History;* Ranke; Lingard; and Macaulay.

Constitutional. Sir J. F. Stephen, *History of the Criminal Law* (3 vols., 1883), I, 325 ff. for judicial procedure in the seventeenth century.

Biography. Lord John Russell, *Life of William Lord Russell* (4th ed., 1853). Anonymous, *Adventures of James II* (1904), very sympathetic as regards James.

Special. John Pollock, *The Popish Plot* (1903), the authority on the subject; pt. IV deals with the procedure in the treason trials.

Contemporary. J. S. Clarke, *The Life of King James the Second*, "collected out of memoirs writ of his own hand" (1816).

For further works relating to this chapter see Chapter XXXII, above.

Selections from the sources. Adams and Stephens, nos. 228–232. Robertson, *Select Statutes and Cases*, pt. I, nos. X, XI, pt. II, nos. II–VII.

CHAPTER XXXIV

JAMES II AND THE "GLORIOUS REVOLUTION" (1685–1688)

Strength of the Monarchy at the Accession of James, in 1685. — Charles, though lazy, dissipated, and unprincipled, was tactful and wary, and left his brother in a position of unusual strength. The Whig opposition was crushed and discouraged; the municipal corporations were under royal control; France stood in need of the friendship of the English King, while the Dutch, the Protestant princes of Germany, and Spain, the Empire, and the Papacy, all of whom dreaded French ascendancy, courted his alliance. Moreover, James, during the first few months of his reign, steadily strengthened his position: he obtained an ample grant from Parliament and, in order to face a rebellion which was easily suppressed, he secured a large standing army. Had he been content with the religious situation as Charles had left it, he might have ruled long and successfully, but his rash ambition to reëstablish the Church of Rome alienated even the most devoted of his supporters, the Tory High Churchmen, drove them into the ranks of the opposition, and led to his overthrow.

Personal Traits of the New King. — James was nearly fifty-two years old.[1] During twelve years of exile he had seen service both in the French and the Spanish armies. Then, and afterwards as a naval commander in the Dutch wars, he had shown himself to be brave and not without ability. Also, as Lord High Admiral, he had, in the teeth of great obstacles, proved an enlightened administrator, fond of details, and, for a man who lived at Court in those days, comparatively free from vices of drunkenness and gambling. But here his virtues ended. He was dull and obstinate, ready to sacrifice everything for the advancement of his Church. Much of the cruelty charged to him may have been due to the agents whom he trusted, but a chief duty of rulers should be to choose worthy servants and upright counselors; James's failure to do this was a main cause for his downfall.

[1] He was born, 14 October, 1633.

The First Measures of the Reign. — From his very accession, 6 February, 1685, he celebrated mass with open doors, though he disarmed the apprehension of the bulk of his subjects by declaring to the Council that he would make it his endeavor "to preserve the Government in Church and State as it is by law established." Many Catholics and Quakers[1] were released from prison; but the penal laws were rigidly enforced against the bulk of the Dissenters. Oates, already under sentence of perjury, received a flogging from which it is a marvel that he survived. In addition, he was sentenced to prison for life and to be pilloried five times a year.

Parliament Meets and Grants James a Fixed Revenue. — Parliament, which met 19 May, 1685, readily granted to James for life, the revenues of the late King, together with certain additional duties, which, added together, gave him about £1,900,000 a year, a sum which, considering that he was a thrifty Monarch, abundantly sufficed for his ordinary needs. Less pliable in religious matters, Parliament met the King's proposal to remove the tests excluding Catholics from office by insisting that the anti-Catholic laws be strictly enforced. Such was the situation when news came that Monmouth had landed on the south coast. Pausing only to pass an Act of Attainder against him and to set a price on his head, the Houses adjourned, July 2.

The Exiles. Argyle lands in Scotland. Failure and Execution. — Following the final triumph of Charles, crowds of bitter-tempered exiles had fled to the Low Countries. Their hopes centered in Monmouth, who, until his father's death, had been content to shine as a social leader at the Hague. Next to him in importance was the Earl of Argyle, head of the great clan Campbell and son of the famous covenanting leader who had been executed after the Restoration. Egged on by the busy plotters, Monmouth and Argyle were induced to attempt simultaneous invasions of England and Scotland. Argyle, who started in May, finally reached the land of his own people on the west coast; but, owing to dissensions, desertions, inadequate supplies, and lack of enthusiasm for the cause, he failed miserably. His forces were scattered, he himself was captured and taken to Edinburgh where, 30 June, 1685, he was beheaded, meeting his fate with lofty resignation.

Monmouth's Rising and Its Failure (1685). — Meantime, 11 June, Monmouth landed at Lyme Regis. There, at the market cross, a Declaration was read which charged James with all manner of horrid and unlikely crimes — such as burning London, strangling Godfrey,

[1] They were *personæ gratæ* with the Sovereign because passive resistance was one of the tenets of their religion.

and poisoning his late brother — and stated that the young Duke had come to deliver the land from popery and tyranny and to submit his claims to a free and lawful Parliament. The peasants in the country round about pressed eagerly to join him; but the gentry held aloof. At Taunton, Monmouth, contrary to his promise, proclaimed himself King. He soon had to reckon with a royal army, composed partly of regular troops and partly of local militia, which encamped, 5 July, at Sedgemoor in the Somerset marshes. Here they easily repulsed a night attack and scattered the Duke's raw levies, fighting valiantly, but poorly mounted on cart-horses, and many of them armed only with scythes tied on poles. The battle of Sedgemoor was the last important battle fought on English soil. Monmouth, who fled when he found the battle was going against him, was discovered two days later, hiding in a ditch, disguised as a shepherd. Although he pled abjectly for his life, it proved of no avail. He was beheaded 15 July, 1685. Monmouth's popularity among the peasants of Somerset and Dorset amounted to veneration. Refusing to believe that he was dead, they cherished for years the hope that he would reappear to lead them.

"Kirke's Lambs" and Jeffreys' "Bloody Assize." — The vengeance of James was swift and terrible. First, Colonel Kirke with his regiment of "Lambs"[1] butchered scores without trial, enriching himself, however, by sparing those from whom he could extort money.[2] In the infamous "Bloody Assize," held by Judge Jeffreys in the autumn, more than 300 were hanged, drawn and quartered, and 800 more were transported. For generations there were spots in the countryside that the natives would not pass after nightfall, from the gruesome memories preserved of bodies swinging in chains and of heads and quarters fixed on poles. During the trials, Jeffreys, who afterwards boasted that he had hanged more traitors than any of his predecessors since the Conquest, roared, swore and joked at the trembling victims in a way that made his name a terror for years to come. All that can be said for him is that he was only a degree worse than the typical judge of the century, and that, owing to a painful malady, he drank so heavily that he was scarcely ever sober. Some have tried to excuse James from responsibility for the acts of his brutal judges, but to those who appealed for mercy he showed himself harder than the marble chimneypiece in his audience chamber, and he not only rewarded Jeffreys with the Lord Chancellorship on his return

[1] So called from a device on their banner representing the Lamb of God.

[2] Of late the view has been gaining ground that the charges against Kirke may have been exaggerated.

from the West, but honored him with his fullest confidence throughout the reign.

The Turning Point in the Reign. Foreign Relations. — In spite of the hatred smoldering in the west, the power of James seemed unassailable. He had crushed and overawed those who dared to rise against him. The Church and the bulk of his subjects were still loyal, he had an adequate regular revenue, and a strong standing army. Nevertheless, the autumn of 1685 marked a decisive turn in the tide of his affairs. The situation abroad and the execution of Monmouth, followed by a long succession of follies, led to his downfall within the space of three years. His connection with Louis XIV was most unfortunate; for while he gave the French King no active assistance, he received subsidies from him and was popularly supposed, at home and abroad, to be a partner in the French King's designs of establishing an ascendancy on the Continent, bound to be stoutly resisted by Catholic as well as Protestant rulers. Not only was James hampered by an unpopular ally, but also, by putting Monmouth out of the way, he removed a great cause of dissension between his opponents, some of whom supported the late Duke as the successor to the English throne. Now all parties united for William of Orange. So, when James began to make it clear that he was bent on reintroducing Catholicism into England, the ground was prepared for an irresistible conbination — European and English — against him. Such being the situation, it was most unfortunate for the prospects of James that Louis, in October, 1685, revoked the Edict of Nantes, which, in theory at least, had protected his Huguenot subjects for over a century. Many of them took refuge in England, and the tales they told revived the terror which had somewhat subsided after the discrediting of Oates and his gang. What Louis had done in France James might do in England.

James Breaks with his Parliament (November, 1685). — It was at this unfortunate juncture that James began to show his hand. He had three measures which he was determined to put through: to maintain intact the standing army, which had been increased from 6000 to 20,000 in consequence of Monmouth's rising; to obtain the repeal of the Test Act, for the purpose of retaining a number of Catholics who already held office in the army and to make it possible to put others in military and civil positions; and, finally, to repeal the Habeas Corpus Act, which prevented him from dealing summarily with those who were disposed to resist his authority. Parliament, which met 9 November, vigorously opposed these projects. This so angered the King that he prorogued the Houses before they had passed a money

bill to pay for the expenses incurred in suppressing the recent insurrection. He also dismissed from office many who had voted against his measures. Parliament never met again during the reign.

James's New Counselors. — The chief power soon fell into the hands of Lord Sunderland. While, perhaps, not so black as he is usually painted, he was inordinately ambitious, never hesitating to change his politics or his religion whenever he thought he saw a chance to advance his interests. Though he did not profess himself a Roman Catholic till the summer of 1688, he attached himself, not long after James broke with Parliament, to a small group of extremists whose policy was decidedly French and Jesuit. Among them were Father Petre and Richard Talbot, the latter commonly known as "lying Dick Talbot," a crafty intriguer who masqueraded as a jovial roisterer. The ill-advised designs of those men and a few more who joined with them, were a source of grave apprehension to the moderate Roman Catholics, especially to the nuncio and the vicar apostolic whom the Pope had sent over to restrain the zeal of James, and to counteract the intrigues of France.

The Case of Sir Edward Hales (June, 1686). — James awakened concern by one rash act after another. Since Parliament had refused to sanction the repeal of the Test Act, he determined to render it void by filling offices in spite of its restrictions. However, in order to give his procedure a show of legality in the eyes of subjects, he decided to extort from the judges a decision in his favor. Four who refused to do his bidding were replaced by others more pliant. To bring the case before the courts, the coachman of Sir Edward Hales was employed to start suit against his master for holding a commission in the army, contrary to the Test Act. Eleven of the twelve judges decided that, notwithstanding the provisions of the Act, he was entitled by a royal authorization to hold office. Thus fortified, James, in July, admitted four Roman Catholics to the Privy Council. More startling still, he proceeded to invade the two strongholds of Anglicanism, the Church and the Universities. He issued dispensations enabling Roman Catholics to hold ecclesiastical benefices, he appointed to the Bishopric of Oxford one who was a Roman Catholic at heart, and made a professed Romanist Dean of Christ Church; moreover, Jesuit chaplains were introduced at University College, where they set up a press for printing controversial pamphlets.

The Court of Ecclesiastical Commission (July, 1686). — It was necessary, if the King was to control the Church, to have a means of punishing those who refused to obey him. To that end, he revived what was in substance the Court of High Commission, which had been

abolished by the Long Parliament and which had not been restored at the Restoration. James called his body the Ecclesiastical Commission, and insisted that it differed from the tribunal suppressed by Parliament, in that its jurisdiction was confined to the clergy. The first work of the Commission was to deprive Henry Compton, Bishop of London, of the administration of his See, because he had refused to suspend the Dean of Norwich, who had preached against a royal proclamation aimed to silence controversial sermons denouncing "Popery."

Popular Excitement and Opposition. — By virtue of a wholesale issue of dispensations, Roman Catholic chapels were set up all over the country, and a church and school for Jesuits was installed at the Savoy Palace. In November, 1686, the new Royal Chapel was opened at Whitehall "with a world of mysterious ceremony." Monks and friars in their religious garb appeared again in the streets of London, and so alarmed and enraged the people that riots were of frequent occurrence. In order to overawe the unquiet, 13,000 men of the standing army were quartered on Hounslow Heath; but the camp became a great resort for Londoners, who flocked there on Sundays, and the soldiers came to share more and more in the sentiments of the citizens. From the pulpits throughout the land sermons were preached against "Popery," while floods of pamphlets defending the Protestant faith issued from the press. In spite of the growing opposition and of the reproaches even of the Pope and the moderate Roman Catholics, the King went on stubbornly, and the situation grew more and more tense.

The Situation in Scotland under Charles II. — In Scotland, too, there was grave discontent. The Restoration had been welcomed because of aversion to Cromwell's military rule and the domination of Presbyterians. Yet the result had been disappointment. The Scots had changed governors, but arbitrary government continued in a form more cruel and oppressive than ever before and became corrupt as well. The Presbyterians were kept down rigidly and the Episcopalians were mere creatures of the Government. Trade and commerce, too, suffered because of the Dutch wars and the abolition of the free trade existing under the Commonwealth and the Protectorate. By an Act passed in 1663, known as the "Bishops' Dragnet," heavy fines were imposed on all who did not attend the parish church. Those who remained obdurate, and they were mainly centered in the southwestern counties, suffered cruelly at the hands of the King's dragoons, who were quartered in their houses and who ruthlessly searched out and broke up their "field conventicles." A

rising of some of the more desperate in 1666 only resulted in harsher measures of repression. After a bloody carnival of execution and torture, milder measures were tried, but when, in consequence, conventicles began to multiply again, the authorities reverted to a policy of systematic coercion.

The Rising of the Covenanters (1679). — A crisis came in the year 1679 with the murder of Archbishop Sharp, whom the Presbyterians detested as a treacherous deserter from their cause, and as a bloodthirsty persecutor. Then followed another revolt which was only crushed with the defeat of the insurgents at Bothwell Bridge, 22 June. In December, the Duke of York was sent to Scotland to govern the country, and, during the period of his régime, there began a policy of suppression which ultimately alienated the mass of Scotsmen from his cause. His military agent, John Graham of Claverhouse, who at first was occupied mainly against the fanatical extremists in the southwest, gained the name of "bloody Clavers," though modern writers are inclined to think the charges against him have been exaggerated.

Scotland in the Reign of James II. — The accession of James was marked by even greater severity against the Covenanters than had been employed under Charles II. Not content with renewing the law which made the taking of the Covenant treason, the Estates slavishly passed an Act providing that all persons, preachers or hearers, proved to have been present at a Conventicle were to be punished with death and confiscation. When, however, the King sent them a letter recommending the repeal of the penal laws against "his innocent subjects, those of the Roman Catholic religion," they returned such a hesitant answer that he closed the session, and proceeded to carry out his policy by means of the Privy Council: he annulled the tests, he allowed Roman Catholics to worship in public, and removed from office those who opposed his will. This aroused such a storm that he, forthwith, issued letters of indulgence allowing to Presbyterians the same privileges which he had accorded to Roman Catholics. Instead, however, of increasing his supporters and allaying dissatisfaction, as he had hoped, the measure was fatal for James's power in Scotland: for it led to the return of many Presbyterian preachers of the extremer sort who organized an opposition which expelled him from the throne of Scotland.

James's Irish Policy. — In Ireland, where there was a Roman Catholic majority, the aims of the King were more far-reaching. He designed to make the old faith dominant and to employ the Irish as an instrument in his efforts to bring about the conversion of the two neighboring Kingdoms, and he had good ground on which to work.

To be sure, in spite of the restrictions on the wool trade and the cattle export, the country had prospered since the Restoration; for the restrictions had not been enforced, while the linen industry had flourished. But the trade shackles were galling; the Episcopal Church had power and revenues in inverse proportion to its size, and the bulk of the land, as well as the political power, lay in the hands of the English and Scotch colonists. The native Irish yearned to recover the possessions of which they had been deprived, and the Catholic extremists aimed at ascendancy. Irish affairs were in the hands of the Commander of the army, Richard Talbot, Earl of Tyrconnel, who was made Lord Lieutenant in 1687.

The First Declaration of Indulgence (4 April, 1687). — In England, James, finding after preliminary examinations, or "closetings," that there was little prospect of securing a Parliament that would support his cherished policy of repealing the tests and the penal laws, determined to proceed on his own authority. So, April, 1687, he published a Declaration of Indulgence granting to all his subjects the free exercise of their religion, suspending the execution of all penal laws in matters ecclesiastical, and removing all oaths and tests for the holding of military and civil offices. The High Church Tories, struck with amazement and terror, thereupon began to make overtures to their old enemies, the Dissenters. All they could offer, however, was remote and uncertain, while the relief tendered by James was immediate. On the other hand, his proffered relief was not only unsanctioned by Parliament but coupled with concessions to the Roman Catholics. The result was a split in the Nonconformist ranks. A minority accepted gratefully.[1] The majority, including such men as Baxter and Bunyan, stoutly refused.

Dykevelt's Mission to England (1687). — It was about this time that many began seriously to look to William of Orange as their champion against James and Roman Catholicism. Chosen by the Dutch to be Commander-in-Chief and Stadholder in the critical year 1672, his guiding aim was to check the growth of France in order to preserve the liberties of his people, and his main reason for desiring the crown of England was that he might secure English resources to aid him in his great work. Hitherto, he had held aloof from English politics, but now while not yet ready to strike, he undertook to prepare the way for a possible intervention by sending an envoy, Dykevelt, under the cover of a special mission to the English Government, to sound the opposition leaders. Dykevelt, during his brief stay,

[1] The King's chief agent in attaching them to his cause was William Penn, a sincere, if somewhat ill-advised, advocate of toleration.

strove busily to ingratiate himself with all classes. He assured High Churchmen of his master's friendship for Episcopacy and the Book of Common Prayer; he held out to Nonconformists the prospect of toleration and comprehension; and to Roman Catholics the repeal of the penal laws.

The Royal Attack on the Universities. — James, on the other hand, was continually making enemies for himself. One of the rashest steps in his headlong course he took when he ventured to attack the Universities, who were traditionally as hostile to Roman Catholicism as they were devoted to Monarchy. While Cambridge did not escape the inroads of his Romanizing aggression, the bitterest struggle was waged at Oxford, where James insisted upon putting in a candidate of his own as President of Magdalen College. When the Fellows, to whom the right of election belonged, refused to admit the legality of the proceeding, they were ejected, September, 1687, and declared incapable of holding any ecclesiastical benefice, while Magdalen was for a brief period turned into a Roman Catholic seminary. Oxford was thrown into a state of defiant excitement, and subscriptions were raised all over the country for the victims of the royal wrath.

James's Attempt to Pack a Parliament (1687–1688). — Realizing that the existing Parliament was unalterably opposed to his policy, James had finally dissolved it in July, 1687.[1] Nevertheless, since he still desired to secure parliamentary sanction of his abrogation of the tests and the penal laws, he made preparations to pack a body pledged to do his will. With that end in view, he caused the municipal corporations to be again remodeled; for the High Church Tories put in by Charles opposed his policy. He appointed sheriffs from his own creatures, and he ordered the Lords Lieutenants to question the magistrates of their respective counties as to how they would act in the event of a general election. In some places he even went so far as to quarter troops. Promises of support, with the alternative of dismissal, were also exacted from officials in all the public departments. One poor customs house officer declared that he obeyed for fourteen reasons, a wife and thirteen young children. In general, however, the result was most discouraging to James; nearly half the Lords Lieutenants refused to carry out the royal orders and had to be dismissed, while the great majority of those questioned would give no further assurance than that, if elected, they would obey their conscientious convictions, or if voters, would cast their ballots only for men whose views agreed with their own.

[1] It had never met since the autumn session of 1685.

The Second Declaration of Indulgence and the Protest of the Seven Bishops (April–May, 1688). — On 27 April, 1688, James reissued his Declaration of Indulgence, and followed it by an Order in Council, published 7 May, commanding the clergy to read the Declaration on two successive Sundays and directing the bishops to distribute copies throughout their dioceses. By way of reply, Archbishop Sancroft called a meeting at Lambeth Palace on the evening of 18 May, where he drew up a petition, in which it was declared, with great professions of loyalty, that the Declaration was illegal and that the petitioners could not be parties to its public reading during divine service. It was signed by the Archbishop and six of the assembled Bishops, after which the six Bishops crossed the Thames and delivered it to the King at Whitehall. James was furious. "This is a standard of rebellion," he cried, and repeated the phrase over and over again, while the Bishops protested that they were no rebels. That night the petition was printed, and circulated rapidly throughout the city and country. How it happened no one knows; for the audience with the King was private. The excitement grew in intensity, and, when Sunday came, the Declaration was read in only four of the hundred churches in and about London. By the following Sunday a few more clergymen had been whipped into line; but in most cases the congregation got up and left to avoid hearing the hated Declaration. Although Sunderland recommended moderation, the King, on the advice of Jeffreys, ordered the Bishops to be tried for libel. Meanwhile, they were committed to the Tower. As they passed down the Thames, crowds in boats thronged the river, and others ran along the banks crying: "God bless your lordships." Even the soldiers who conducted the prisoners asked their blessing, while those off duty drank their healths.

The Birth of the Prince (10 June, 1688). — On Sunday, 10 June, while they still awaited their trial, a son was born to King James. This contributed more than any other single event to precipitate the crisis soon to follow, for, hitherto, many had consoled themselves with the thought that James's daughter and heir Mary was a Protestant. Now the prospect of an endless Roman Catholic succession suddenly loomed up. A story was at once started that no child had been born to the Queen, but that the little Prince, now proclaimed as such, had been secretly introduced into the Queen's chamber and passed off as the royal heir. While the tale was generally believed, there is little doubt that that charge of trickery was absolutely baseless. However that may be, the popular leaders now made up their minds, when a fitting moment came, to send for William of Orange.

The Trial of the Seven Bishops (June, 1688). — When the day fixed for the trial of the Seven Bishops arrived, the excitement had spread everywhere from Scotland to Cornwall. They were charged with having produced "a false, malicious, and seditious libel." Fortunately for the cause of liberty, their counsel were forced to abandon technicalities, and proceeded to prove that the paper in question was not false, malicious, nor a libel, but a respectful petition setting forth facts known to be true, and delivered privately into the hands of the King with no intention of stirring up strife. The jury remained closeted from nightfall until six o'clock the next morning before they reached an agreement. As they left the court after their verdict of acquittal had been announced, the people surged around them, crying: "God bless you!" "You have saved us all to-day." The city and the country, as the news spread, rang with shouts of joy. Even the soldiers in Hounslow Heath cheered lustily. The Opposition had won a great victory on the broad constitutional grounds that James's exercise of the dispensing power was illegal, and that his subjects had the right of petition against it.

The Invitation to William (30 June, 1688). — All distinctions of politics and religious were, for the time being, merged in a general combination against the King. Many, even of the High Church clergy, who during their supremacy, had argued that the laws of God as well as the laws of man demanded unquestioning obedience to the civil authority, were now ready to contend: "that extreme oppression might justify resistance . . . and the oppression which the nation suffered was extreme." Others, who shuddered at the notion of active resistance, were ready to go as far as passive resistance, asserting, that in view of his late acts, they were not bound to obey the King. Such was the state of the public mind when, 30 June, 1688, the day of the acquittal of the Seven Bishops, a letter signed by seven of the leaders of both parties was sent to William of Orange, inviting him to England and assuring him that nineteen twentieths of the people would rally to his support and that the army of James was full of disaffection.

William's Declaration. — William, however, realized that the undertaking bristled with difficulties. If he crossed the Channel as the champion of Protestantism, the Catholic powers of the Continent might turn against him. However, he was able to reassure them by emphasizing the danger of an Anglo-French ascendancy. With regard to England, if he landed without an army he was very likely to meet the fate of Monmouth. On the other hand, English patriotism might resent an invasion of foreign troops. Concluding that the latter was the less serious danger, he prepared an army and a fleet. In order to pre-

pare the way for his coming, he caused a Declaration to be published in which he rehearsed James's violation of the fundamental laws, his favor to Roman Catholics and his oppression of Protestants. Disclaiming any thought of conquest, he declared that he was going to submit the issues at stake to a full and free Parliament.

James's Belated Concessions. — James, awaking at last to the gravity of the crisis, made a belated effort to conciliate the Tories who had once been so devoted to him. In the last weeks of September, 1688, he reversed one after another of his late unpopular acts: he reinstated Bishop Compton, abolished the Ecclesiastical Commission, and agreed to restore the forfeited municipal charters, as well as the Lord Lieutenants and various magistrates whom he had dismissed. It was felt, however, that these belated concessions were only drawn from him by the impending danger, while, even yet, he refused to give up his dispensing power or to remove his Catholic supporters from military and civil office.[1]

William's Landing at Torbay (5 November, 1688). — William, having been delayed for days by adverse weather, at length succeeded in landing, 5 November, at Torbay, on the coast of Devonshire. From Torbay he marched to Exeter, which he selected for his first headquarters. Although the magistrates tried to close the gates against him, crowds flocked to welcome him as a deliverer. James hastened to Salisbury, whither he had sent his army to face the invaders. On his arrival, he found the situation most discouraging; for, heartened by the defection of men in higher station, the western counties had risen, and the gentry who had joined William at Exeter had bound themselves together in a formal organization to secure their liberties and religion. The North, too, was up in arms. James, in order to stem the tide, was keen for bringing on an engagement at once; but he was suddenly taken with a hemorrhage of the nose which kept him inactive for three days. When he recovered, he was so disheartened by rumors of treason among his officers that he decided to retreat. The flight of John Churchill, his most efficient general, was a crushing blow, all the more so, because Churchill's wife, an ambitious intriguer, had the King's second daughter, Princess Anne, under absolute control. The retreat and the constant desertions demoralized the army. Fearing for his capital, James hastened back to London, where he found that Anne herself had already fled from Whitehall. "God help me," cried the unhappy Monarch, "my own children have forsaken me."

[1] Yet very wisely he did get rid of Sunderland, who, in spite of his brazen assurances, was suspected of treasonable correspondence with the invaders.

The Flight of James (11 December, 1688). — In his extremity, James issued writs for a Parliament to meet 13 January, 1689. Also he appointed a commission of three to treat with William, in the meanwhile, and issued a proclamation granting full pardon to all who were in arms against him. This was merely to gain time. Already he had made up his mind to escape, and hastily made preparations for flight. His first care was to send the Queen and the little Prince safely out of the country; after this he annulled the writs for the promised Parliament, destroying those which had not yet been sent out. On the morning of 11 December he rose at three o'clock, was rowed a short distance down the Thames in a wherry, dropping the Great Seal in the river as he proceeded, and boarded a hoy which he had engaged to transport him to France.

His Capture and Second Flight. — The news of his flight aroused a storm of excitement, and, that night, lawlessness broke loose. Roman Catholic chapels were sacked and burned, private houses were attacked, and the residences of foreign ambassadors even were not spared. Suddenly, in the midst of the confusion, the rumor spread that James had been caught by a band of fishermen in search of plunder and escaping Jesuits. William was grievously disappointed; but he quickly made up his mind that, without making it too evident, a second chance to escape must be pressed upon James. So he was removed from Whitehall, whither he had been taken, to Rochester. There the house in which he lodged was left unguarded in the rear so that he was able to slip out through the garden to the banks of the Medway. Thence he was rowed down the river in a skiff until he found a fishing smack which conveyed him to France. Louis XIV received both James and his Queen with great ceremony and hospitality, lodged them at St. Germain and provided them with an ample revenue, vowing that ere long he would restore them to their throne.

William's Arrival in London (18 December, 1688). — William, on his arrival in London, was waited on by numerous deputations. Though some extremists pressed him to declare himself King forthwith, William remained true to the promise in his Declaration to settle the government in a parliamentary way. As a preliminary step he summoned the lords spiritual and temporal, the members who had sat in the House of Commons in the reign of Charles II,[1] and a deputation of the London magistrates. This body advised William to assume the provisional government and to call a convention to effect a permanent arrangement.

[1] The members from the first and only Parliament of James were excluded because the remodeling of the corporations had interfered with the free choice of the electors.

The Convention and the Settlement of the Succession. — The Convention, which met 22 January, 1689, framed, after some discussion, a resolution declaring: "that King James, having endeavored to subvert the Constitution of the Kingdom by breaking the original contract between King and People, and, by the advice of Jesuits and other wicked persons, having violated the fundamental laws, and having withdrawn himself out of the Kingdom, had abdicated the Government and that the Throne had thereby become vacant." This clumsy and illogical resolution was adroitly designed to suit all parties: the reference to the original contract was framed for the Whigs, who believed that the Government was a contract between the King and his subjects, and that a Sovereign who broke the contract by the abuse of power could be deposed; the reflection on the Jesuits was for the extreme Protestants; and the assertion regarding the abdication, for those Tories who held that subjects had no right to depose their Sovereign. When the resolution was finally adopted after a long, hot debate, it was decided that William and Mary should be joint sovereigns with the administration in the hands of William.

The Declaration of Right. — Next it was necessary to determine the conditions upon which the crown should be conferred. The result was the Declaration of Right, which, like its two great predecessors[1] deals not with vague general principles, but more particularly with actual grievances of the last two reigns, which are to be safeguarded against for the future. After enumerating the recent attacks made by James on the Protestant religion and the laws and liberties of the Kingdom, it declared: that the pretended power of suspending laws and of dispensing as it has been exercised of late, that the court of Ecclesiastical Commission and other courts of a like nature, that levying money without consent of Parliament, were all illegal; that it was the right of subjects to petition the King, and that all prosecutions for such petitioning were illegal; that maintaining a standing army, except by consent of Parliament, was illegal; that election of members to Parliament ought to be free; that freedom of speech, debate or proceedings in Parliament ought not to be impeached in any court or place outside the two Houses; that excessive bail ought not to be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted; that jurors in cases of high treason ought to be freeholders; and that, for amending and preserving the laws, Parliaments should be held frequently. The Declaration concluded by settling the crown upon William and Mary, and upon the heirs of Mary, Anne and William respectively. Mary arrived from Holland, 12 February, and the new

[1] The other two being Magna Carta (1215) and the Petition of Right (1628).

Sovereigns were proclaimed 13 February, 1689, in the presence of shouting crowds.

The Peculiar Character of the Revolution of 1688. — Thus ended the "Glorious Revolution." Although, so far as possible, every ancient form had been complied with, it was, from the strictly legal standpoint, a real revolution. The Convention which settled the crown on William and Mary was not properly a Parliament, for it had been summoned by no royal authority. To be sure, the new Sovereigns later declared it a legal body; but since they were its creatures, their assertion could not make it such. Nevertheless, defective as were its proceedings when viewed in a purely legal light, the Revolution can be justified, both from the issues at stake and from the moderation with which the movement was conducted. Macaulay, in his classic work on this period, has pointed out that it was a "preserving" not a "destroying" revolution, in which all parties joined — Whig and Tory, Churchmen and Dissenters — to preserve the fruits of the Reformation and the Puritan Revolution, to maintain Protestantism, the supremacy of Parliament and the freedom of the subject. The fundamental laws were not changed but defined and secured; the old line of Kings, however, was set aside, and thus a final blow was struck at the theory of Divine Right. Never since the expulsion of James II has there been a revolution in England.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

Narrative. Macaulay, *History of England*, in spite of its obvious faults, remains the classic treatment of the subject. Sir James Mackintosh, *Review of the Causes of the Revolution of 1688* (1834) contains a large collection of documents in the appendix.

Biography. Viscount Wolseley, *Life of Marlborough* (vols. I, II, 1894), an apology for Marlborough, left uncompleted at 1702.

For further references see Chapters XXXII, XXXIII above.

Selections from the sources. Adams and Stephens, nos. 233–234. Robertson, *Select Statutes*, pt. II, nos. VIII, IX.

CHAPTER XXXV

PURITAN AND CAVALIER ENGLAND

Characteristics of Seventeenth-century England. — The period from 1603 to 1688 is crowded with incident and notable achievement. It opened with a struggle of Parliament against the attempt of the first Stuart to maintain and strengthen the Tudor absolutism in Church and State, a struggle which culminated in civil war resulting in the defeat and execution of a King, the temporary overthrow of Monarchy and Episcopacy, and the establishment of a republic. The experiment proved premature, and was followed by the restoration, both of the Stuarts and the Established Church. Nevertheless, the Puritan Revolution had not been in vain; henceforth, in spite of occasional reassertions of absolutism, Parliament became, more and more, the supreme power in the State, while Dissent not only survived and flourished, but obtained, before the close of the century, a substantial if imperfect legal recognition. The party system began to take shape and distinct gains were made in law reform. A standing army was established, while the navy grew and obtained a really effective organization. Long strides were taken in the direction of commercial and colonial ascendancy. Manufactures became more varied and wealth increased, together with new comforts and luxuries. Coal was introduced in place of charcoal; tea and coffee appeared; travel and communication were fostered by coaches and packet boats, and amusements multiplied. The newspaper came into being, and the spread of printing, together with the growth of the party system, resulted in myriads of caricatures and satires. There was a striking development in political and economic thinking, as well as in religious and philosophical speculations. Literature, while not reaching the heights of the wonderful Elizabethan Age, was interesting and varied, manifesting new and striking tendencies. Mathematical, physical and physiological sciences showed a marked advance. Such are some of the features of this complex and throbbing age.

Regulation of Trade and Manufactures under James I and Charles I. — While the monopolies and privileged companies fostered by James I and Charles I have been severely attacked, there is little doubt that both these Monarchs aimed, in some degree at least, to regulate the economic life of the nation in the interests of the whole, to maintain high standards of production and to keep the subject employed as well. Such national regulation, however, was difficult to enforce effectively and impartially, while, moreover, the Stuarts mingled with their zeal for the public welfare a tendency toward favoritism and a proneness to utilize their grants as sources of revenue. Thus the system tended to abuse of privilege, to the curbing of healthy competition, and to the discouragement of those outside the pale. Men of ability and enterprise were excluded from trade, especially with foreign markets, or joined the ranks of the interlopers.

Industrial Situation under the First Two Stuarts. — Nevertheless, the period was one of material progress rather than decline. Foreign refugees flocked to the country, the population increased, old industries developed and new ones were introduced, though, under a freer system than that of company control, there might have been a far greater advance. The silk manufacture began to flourish, yet to nothing like the extent noticeable after the influx of French Huguenots which followed the revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685. The cutlers of Sheffield had been incorporated in 1624, but what is now a city of half a million and the chief center of the cutlery industry of the world, was then the possession of a manorial lord who leased the furnaces to the manufacturers. The total population scarcely exceeded two thousand, a third of whom were dependent on charity. There was a great opposition to the smelting of iron ore because of the enormous quantities of charcoal required, which exhausted the forests and threatened the supply of timber for shipbuilding. Although one Dud Dudley devised and patented a successful process, his efforts were frustrated by rivals, and little was done toward applying the method of smelting till the following century. Coal, which was beginning to be employed extensively for fuel in London, was brought by boat from Newcastle and hence was known as sea coal. The wool trade was practically stationary until after the Restoration. In order to encourage the home consumption an Act was passed for burying in wool; nevertheless, there was complaint that many persisted "in adorning their deceased friend's corpse with fine linen, lace, etc., though so contrary to our own true national interest." In spite of the opposition of the wool interests, calicoes, chintzes, and muslins were imported from India, while in

1676, Flemish immigrants introduced the art of calico printing into England.

The Period of the Civil War, the Commonwealth and the Protectorate. — The Civil War and the disorders that followed naturally interrupted trade, yet less than might be expected. The return of the Jews under Cromwell gave considerable impulse to business, and the protests of London merchants against them were based, apparently, rather upon commercial jealousy than religious intolerance. Although the judges decided that the law did not permit them to live in England, Cromwell admitted them on his own authority. Charles II, who refused to reverse the Protector's policy, allowed them to open a synagogue in London.

Trade during the Restoration. — Systematic supervision of trade and industry on the part of the Sovereign, which ceased with the personal government of Charles I, was not revived at the Restoration. Henceforth, commercial regulation belonged largely to Parliament. Some new companies were founded; but, in general, encouragement took the form of tariffs and bounties rather than special privileges to "particular groups" of subjects. The cessation of rigid supervision led to some falling off in the quality of goods; but that was counterbalanced, to some degree, by competition and the use of trade marks. On the other hand, there was a general increase in trade, especially the carrying trade. The Navigation Acts were only partly responsible; for they were not vigorously enforced, nor were the Dutch outstripped by the English until they had been exhausted by the wars of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. Many other factors account for the great colonial and commercial expansion of the post-Restoration period. Charles' marriage brought to the country Bombay, together with increased facilities of trade with the other Portuguese possessions. Spain granted to England the privileges of the most favored nations; also, treaties were made to protect the Levant trade from Turkish pirates, and, though humbling to national pride, proved effective.

Colonial Expansion. — The Elizabethan Age was one of discovery and exploration; the Stuart period marked the beginning of colonization. Although the Dutch still overshadowed the English in the East, notable steps in advance were taken. In the reign of James I, the Persian trade was first "enterprised" by English merchants, and a commercial treaty with the Great Mogul extended English commerce in India, while, before the close of the century, the East India Company was securely established at Bombay, Calcutta, and Madras, and the Royal Africa Company had flourishing possessions

on the Gold Coast and at other points on the Continent of Africa. In America, several of the West India Islands were acquired, and all but one of the thirteen American colonies [1] were established. While Spain and Portugal were mainly concerned with the search for precious metals, and while the French devoted themselves to founding trading posts and missionary stations, the English, if not free from delusions of their time, were the first to establish the policy of home building in the New World.

Agriculture under the First Two Stuarts. — Under the Stuarts the agricultural progress, so marked during the reign of Elizabeth, promised to continue. The rise in prices, due to the increase of precious metals and the growing demand for food, had intervened to check the turning of arable land into sheep pasture, and, with the prospect of increasing profits from corn and meat, renewed energy was devoted to improving conditions of tillage and reclaiming waste lands. The efforts of cultivators were quickened and guided by resourceful writers on agriculture, who suggested more scientific care of cattle and poultry as well as improved methods of treating the soil. Much was learned from the Italians about irrigation and the utilization of water meadows. Rotation of crops by the planting of turnips and clover was urged as a substitute for fallow [2]; potatoes and carrots began to be cultivated, and increasing attention was paid to orchards and gardens. It was in this period that the task of draining the fens in the Eastern Counties was first seriously indertaken, though since Roman times, occasional attempts at reclamation had been made, especially by the monks who lived on the islands dotting the watery and boggy expanse. The enterprise was interrupted during the Civil War and, while resumed during the Commonwealth, met with various set-backs. Some of the work was badly done by "mountebank engineers, idle practitioners, and slothful impatient slubberers," though the greatest difficulty came from the "riotous letts and disturbances" of the natives, who received no compensation for their rights of turf cutting, fowling, fishing, hunting and pasture, and it was not till after the lapse of a century and more that the results of their destruction were repaired.

The Period of the Civil Wars and the Restoration. — The agricultural progress of the first forty years of the century was checked,

[1] Georgia in 1733.

[2] Apparently first introduced in the reign of James I from the Palatinate; turnips had the additional advantage that they could be used to feed cattle over the winter. Formerly most of the live stock had been killed and salted. But turnips and clover did not come into general use until the eighteenth century.

to a large degree, by the war. The period of the Commonwealth and the Protectorate was marked by a revival, to which Cromwell contributed by his enlightened support. Another period of stagnation set in under Charles II. Many facts beside the blighting effects of the war explain why the early promise of the century was not fulfilled. For one thing, most of the writers who urged wise and necessary improvements proved to be failures in practice, so that their example did not inspire confidence. Then the system of common tillage and open fields, which, in spite of the enclosure movement, still survived in large parts of the country, was an obstacle to individual enterprise. Moreover, the Cavalier estates had been heavily embarrassed by the sequestrations and other exactions from which they had suffered during the Civil War, while those of the other party who had acquired their lands were uncertain of their tenure after the Restoration. Landlords were unprogressive, grasping, and niggardly in advancing capital, tenants were discouraged from making improvements when the only prospect was increased rent or eviction in the interest of the landlord or of some one who would offer a higher bid. Then roads were bad and canals as yet non-existent, so that new ideas spread slowly, and the producer was as yet limited to local markets. The great development in agriculture was not to come for almost a century.

Roads and Travel. — Traveling was not only difficult but dangerous. On dark, moonless nights the traveler stood in grave danger of losing his way in the unenclosed heaths and fens that, in many parts of the country, lay on either side of the road. If he managed to keep a straight path, he was, in wet seasons, constantly liable to mire his horse or his coach, and sometimes his progress was altogether cut off by floods. The coach from London to Oxford — a distance of fifty-four miles — took two days of thirteen hours each. Great was the amazement of the good people of the time when, in 1669, a " flying coach " was started which made the journey between six A.M. and seven P.M. of the same day. In spite of storms of opposition at the great risk involved in going at such a reckless speed, flying coaches, which averaged fifty miles a day in summer and thirty in winter, were started, before the close of the reign of Charles II, from most of the chief towns south of York and east of Exeter. Many still traveled by post horses rented at various inns along the road. The coaches were great lumbering affairs, drawn by four or six horses. There were stage wagons for merchandise; though, on the by-roads, and even on the main highways in the North and West, goods were transported on the backs of pack-horses.

Highwaymen. — To add to the woes of the traveler, there were the highwaymen who infested the roads in every direction, especially those which led to London. Men made their wills before undertaking a journey, and started out with pistols in their holsters, blunderbusses in their coaches, and often guarded by armed attendants. Some of the outlaws of the period were almost as famous as the legendary Robin Hood.

Inns and Ale Houses. — Happily, English inns were famous for their plenty, comfort and good cheer. The larger ones were equipped with monstrous supplies of beef and mutton, hogsheads of ale, cellars of wine and well stocked stables. Besides, there were many of the humbler sort "with the cleanly swept brick floor, with the ancient ballads stuck on the walls, with the linen fragrant with the scent of lavender, with the open fire and the snowy curtains, and every material detail savoring of comfort and repose. . . ." There were also, in rural villages, simple alehouses whither the natives, from the squire to the humblest toiler, came to talk and to doze.

Social Classes. — The gradations of classes in rural England were the nobility; the country gentry, who possessed broad acres; the yeomen, or small freeholders; the tenant farmers, and the agricultural laborers. In addition there were the country parsons who occupied a somewhat anomalous position. While class distinctions were deeply rooted and most folk died in the station in which they were born, there was a degree of close friendly association. High and low often mingled in the village schools and the grammar schools of the market towns. In cases where the sons of nobility and gentry were educated at home by tutors, boys of lesser rank were admitted, not infrequently, as companions or pages to share their studies. After this preliminary training the noble and the wealthy, and even a favored few of the lesser sort, might proceed to the great endowed schools such as Eton, Winchester, and Westminster. Many of the elder sons, after painfully struggling with the elements of learning, settled down at once upon their estates with a stock of knowledge not much in excess of the humble clodhopper. Others were sent with a tutor to make a grand tour of the Continent. Others, again, before traveling abroad, went for a time to Oxford or Cambridge. At the Universities there were marked distinctions of rank; for the teaching and clerical professions were recruited largely from the middle class, from the sons of farmers and tradesmen. Numbers had to earn their own way, as servitors, or "sizars," making the beds, sweeping the chambers and performing other menial duties for the affluent gentlemen commoners. Not a few of the younger sons of the gentry found a career in the law or

medical professions, although some took holy orders. The former went to London to reside for a specified number of terms at the Inns of Court or to enroll in the College of Physicians and walk the hospitals. Others sought service in the Continental wars or engaged in commerce, either in the City or in the neighboring provincial town. These latter formed a link between the landed and the trading classes. Frequently, they married rich tradesmen's daughters, while, on the other hand, merchants who had become wealthy bought estates and set up as country gentlemen.

The Nobility and Country Gentry. — During the Stuart period the bulk of the older nobility, especially of the soberer sort, remained comfortably on their estates, where they lived in ample leisure, mainly occupied in hospitality and the pursuits of the chase, leaving the votaries of pleasure and the climbers to seek their diversion or to push their fortunes at Court. The rural gentry, with a few shining exceptions, were rude in their manner of life, prejudiced and often illiterate. Few left home save at the most infrequent intervals, while such fragrants of book learning as they had acquired were soon forgotten amid the business and pleasures of their rural seclusion — management of land and cattle, dickering at market, riding and hunting, and huge dinners, washed down by copious potations of ale; they had no newspapers or periodicals, and little opportunity for meeting men of affairs and information. Nevertheless, ignorant and uncouth as they often were, they had a pride of family, which, if it made them overbearing and impatient of contradiction, impelled them to cherish high standards of honor. It was from this class that the justices of the peace were recruited, and their experience and responsibility were bound to develop self-reliance and executive capacity.

The Yeomen and the Farmers. — Next below the landed gentry were the yeomen and the tenant farmers. The former were freeholders who tilled their lands with the help of a few servants and laborers. They were a sturdy class, many of them Dissenters, who with the city tradesmen went far to counterbalance the Toryism of the squirearchy and the country parson. Toward the close of the period, however, they were already on the road to extinction; for the large landowners and the well-to-do city merchants, anxious to found estates, were beginning to buy them out. The farmers, who hired their lands, with holdings averaging from 40 to 50 acres, formed a body almost as numerous as the freeholders. Competition was keen, rents were high, and they were destined to go the way of the freeholders, to give place to tenants of large holdings and capitalist cultivators.

The Clergy. — There were, in the Restoration period, about 10,000 clergy of the Church of England, four fifths of whom received an income of not more than £50 each. While there was a great difference between the bishops and town clergy, on the one hand, and the domestic chaplains and country parsons, on the other, the poverty and menial status of the latter probably has been exaggerated. Many there were, no doubt, with large families in poor parishes, who had to eke out their scanty stipend by working small farms, who, with few or no books, denied the advantages of travel, and deprived of uplifting associations, were in a state not far above the peasants of their flocks. There were, too, chaplains who were household drudges, for whom the cook or the lady's maid was thought a fitting match. On the other hand, there were many younger sons of gentlemen, or even nobles, who sought a career in the Church; not a few of the seventeenth-century poets were rural clergymen, and a long list of works on divinity will testify to the erudition of many others. Certainly, there are few periods in English history when the clergy exercised more influence than during the interval between the Restoration and the death of Anne.

The Agricultural Laborers. — Out of an estimated population of 5,000,000 about one half, including their families, were laborers and small cotters. They lived on intimate terms with the small farmers and yeomen who employed them, and, if unmarried, they ate at the farmers' tables, sharing in all except puddings and special delicacies. Yet their state was a miserable one. Wages were low, though supplemented to some extent by surviving rights on the common lands, by the domestic system of spinning and weaving, and the employment of the women in the fields at harvest time. They had no fresh meat during the greater part of the year, no wheaten bread and as yet no tea or coffee. Sanitary conditions were still worse. Their houses were still mere hovels with walls of mud and roofs of thatch, with rarely more than a single chimney and no glazed windows. They slept crowded together in stuffy rooms; the advantages of bathing and fresh air were not yet understood, and both the atmosphere and the water were contaminated by sewage and refuse. The plague did not cease its visitations till 1665, infant mortality was appalling, and medicine was only emerging into a science.

Prevalence of Superstition. — Many superstitions were rife, some of them cruel and terrifying. Even at the close of the century the bulk of the people still believed in witches — malicious, spiteful old women who had sold their chances of future salvation and had leagued themselves with the devil, creatures who blighted the crops and

maimed the cattle of their neighbors and held nightly revels in cellars and larders. They were supposed to ride on broomsticks, and to be attended by familiar spirits in the form of toads and cats. While in Elizabeth's time, the laws against witchcraft were the mildest in Europe, a new and ferocious Act followed the advent of James I, and during the century thousands of poor creatures were executed. Thanks to the good sense and humanity of Cromwell, the persecution was abated during the Commonwealth, and was not resumed after the Restoration with anything like the old rigor, though many continued to nourish the delusion. If witches were the victims of popular superstition and hatred — though they were often sought for their charms to ward off diseases and, in the case of lovers, to win the affections of some coy village damsel — alchemists, astrologers, and fortune tellers, many of them thieves and sharpers, throve upon the prevailing credulity.

Counterbalancing Charms of the Age. — On the other hand, many current beliefs illumined the pervading monotony with touches of poetry. Men told of the lubber fiend, or Lob-lie-by-the-fire, who came down the chimney after the household was asleep, swept the floors and did all manner of work if placated by a bowl of cream by the fireside. It caused pleasant shudders to think that ghosts haunted the churchyards, that goblins peopled the fields after nightfall, and that fairies sported in the dark recesses of the forests. Moreover, there was much that was picturesque and charming about the life of the period. Except for London, there were no crowded cities, and the teeming factories with their ceaseless din and smoke were as yet far in the future. People, even in the provincial towns, were surrounded by orchards and gardens, they were within sight of field, wood, and stream. All this, together with the picturesque and graceful architecture — the rambling manor houses, the quaint homes of the lesser folk, and the spacious inns — lent a variety and beauty to life which was reflected in the songs and verses of the period. Before and after the gloomy interval of the Puritan régime, ancient games, festivals and pastimes flourished. At Christmas the Yule log was burned and all classes indulged in brave feasting. There were pretty ceremonies, as for instance, on May Day, when, in the early dawn, the youths and maidens went to the woods and fields and wove garlands to hang on doors and windows. There was cockfighting, and bullbaiting, wrestling, and football played with inflated bladders of swine, and there were masks and pageants.

The North Country. — The balance of wealth and population was still in the south. The northern counties were scantily inhabited,

poor and wild. Peel towers continued to be used as refuges, and manor houses were built of stone and fortified. Judges on circuit were usually accompanied by a strong bodyguard. Parishes kept bloodhounds to protect property, and local taxes were levied to maintain bands of armed men.

The Towns. — Except for London, which had a population of not far from half a million, there were, so late as the Restoration, only four towns with more than ten thousand inhabitants. Small as they were, the provincial towns were far more important social centers than they are to-day. The great county families resorted to them instead of to London for pleasure as well as for business. While the assizes, the quarter sessions and the markets occupied the early part of the day, the evenings were made gay with balls and all sorts of social activities. Owing to the restrictive policy of the gilds and the apprentice laws, excluding the unskilled labor from the rural districts, the population of the towns was a picked one. The gild system, inadequate as it was to meet the growing needs of the country, was not wholly without advantages. It kept up the standard of production, and not only furnished skilled workmen but provided a means of education when schools were few and costly. Where the apprentice had a churlish, avaricious master his lot was sad indeed, what with long hours, hard words and beatings, but under happier circumstances, he had the blessings of a sympathetic home training. After his seven years of service he began work as a journeyman. Often he prospered sufficiently to set up in business for himself, or he might marry his master's daughter and take over the very craft or trade to which he had been bound. But, outside the old centers, the gilds were giving way more and more to the domestic system, especially in the cloth industry; more and more, in the villages and through the countryside, spinners and weavers were working in their own cottages. Moreover, some towns were wise enough to slacken their restrictions. Particularly by welcoming Huguenots — and here London was in the vanguard — they gained an advantage which France threw away.

London. — London at the close of the seventeenth century was, with the possible exception of Amsterdam, without a commercial rival in the world, as well as the center of the social, political, and intellectual life of England. Its aspect was very different from to-day, when the great army of those who have business in the City go every night to the suburbs and the adjoining country. In those days, even the wealthy merchants occupied houses surrounded by walled gardens, which have long since given place to crowded streets, banks,

shops, and warehouses. Artificers and tradesmen lived with their families and apprentices over or behind their shops. The London of the Restoration had few or no suburbs, and most of the now fashionable West End consisted of fields and orchards with here and there a great nobleman's estate. Outside the City walls were the "liberties," a region of slums where the poor, the wretched, and the criminals were herded together in miserable hovels in dirty alleys. The City streets were narrow and crooked; the overhanging upper stories of the buildings on either side presented a quaint appearance, but cut off fresh air and sunlight. The rebuilding which followed the Great Fire of 1666 led to improved sanitary conditions at the sacrifice of medieval picturesqueness. However, a touch of varied charm was preserved in the signs which designated different houses — numbers would have been of very little help, since few coachmen, chairmen, or porters could read. The pavements were wretched, and the gutters, clogged with decayed vegetables and animal refuse, became raging torrents during rainy weather and flooded the streets with watery filth. This was splashed upon the pedestrian by passing coaches and carts, so that "taking the wall" was a much sought privilege which caused many a fight. The street venders kept up a constant din, crying their wares, and the air was choked with the smoke of sea coal which arose from the fires of brewers, dyers, soapboilers, and lime-burners. Mixed with fog it often enveloped the City in almost impenetrable gloom. At such times, as well as at night, it was dangerous to be abroad, what with the slippery, foul and uneven pavements, the countless thieves and cut-throats, and bands of roistering young men of fashion who took delight in attacking and mauling peaceful citizens. Although dueling, which came in at the beginning of the century, was a custom much to be deplored, it had the merit of superseding, to some degree, the custom of seeking revenge against an enemy through hired assassins and bullies. Murders and robberies were alarmingly frequent under the shroud of darkness. Until the reign of Charles II the only lights came from links, lanterns and torches, borne by pedestrians or their attendants. Finally, an enterprising person obtained an exclusive patent for lighting the City, placing a light at every tenth door between the hours of six and twelve; but only on moonless nights and during the season from Michaelmas to Lady Day. A metropolitan police force was as yet undreamed of; the decrepit constables who served by day, and the night watch, largely composed of superannuated and feeble men, afforded little protection. Prosecutions often failed because witnesses dared not appear for fear of the vengeance of the criminal classes

who ran riot through the City. The apprentices were a particularly turbulent element. In their pretended zeal for liberty, frequently a mere cloak for lawlessness, they were often on the rampage, cudgeling those who came in their way, and even pulling down buildings, so that sometimes even the soldiery had to be called out to suppress them. They led in the prejudice of the London rabble against foreigners, particularly Frenchmen, who were jeered at, pursued by cries of " French dog " and " Mounzer," and pelted with stones and filth.

Whitefriars, Paul's Walk, and Whitehall. — Noisy, disorderly and dirty as were the other quarters of the City, there was one district, on the western edge, that was particularly unsavory and horrid. It was known as Whitefriars, from the site of an old Carmelite monastery. Once a sanctuary for criminals, it still retained the privilege of protecting debtors from arrest, and was the haunt of abandoned wretches of all sorts. Officers sent to make arrests were, at the cry of " Rescue ! " set on by furious mobs, so that it often required troops to execute a warrant. Between the hours of eleven and twelve in the forenoon and three and five in the afternoon, " Paul's Walk," the central aisle in the Cathedral, was still the haunt of business and pleasure. Venders of wares, lawyers seeking clients, and beaux, exhibiting their fine raiment, wandered up and down, filling the sacred place with buzz of profane conversation. The Court at Whitehall was a center of politics, gayety and dissipation. Those who had claims to press, or who sought offices, together with the gay libertines who were boon companions of the " Merry Monarch," thronged at his levees. The galleries of the palace were filled with curious crowds watching him " at his meals or as he and his courtiers and mistresses gambled or danced in the evening." They listened eagerly, too, for scraps of news about affairs, foreign and domestic, and greedily devoured such crumbs of gossip and scandal as they were able to get hold of.

Coffee Houses. — What was learned at the royal palace was spread rapidly through the coffee houses which filled the places of the newspapers and public meetings of later times. Originating in the sample room of a Turkey merchant about 1652, coffee houses, in the teeth of stubborn opposition, multiplied so rapidly that there were three thousand in the City and suburbs before the close of the century. Becoming centers for political discussion, they soon aroused the suspicion of the Government. Charles II, in 1675, ordered them to be closed ; but the popular opposition was so intense that the order was revoked within two weeks, on the promise of the landlords to do their best to stop seditious talk and the circulation of libelous books

and pamphlets. There were coffee houses for all classes, professions, and shades of opinion, to say nothing of clubs founded by Cavaliers and Puritans respectively.

The Newspaper and the Post. — Although newspapers, or rather newsbooks or pamphlets, began to appear about the middle of the century, news was chiefly circulated by coffee houses and newsletters[1] until after the expiration of the Licensing Act in 1695. Postal arrangements were still very primitive and inadequate. The mail bags were carried on the backs of horses who traveled by day and night at an average of five miles an hour. Ordinarily, the mails went and came on alternate days; but, in the remote districts, letters were not received or dispatched more than once a week. Rates were very high, averaging twopence for a single letter for eighty miles and increasing with the weight and distance. When the Court was traveling from place to place, arrangements were made for a daily service with London. In the reign of Charles II, regardless of the outcries of the porters, a London penny post was established with a delivery six or eight times a day in the City and four times in the suburbs.

Dress, Food, and Recreations. — In dress as in many other things, there was, after the Restoration, a decided revolt against the simplicity of the Puritan régime. Periwigs appeared for men, and women of fashion began to paint their faces and to adorn them with black patches; they also adopted the practice of wearing vizards, or masks, on occasion, and, with their features thus concealed, grew more bold in their conduct. There was an inordinate rage for gambling, and all sorts of new card games came in after the return of Charles II. Among the pleasure resorts, Vauxhall Gardens, with a great hall for promenading and dancing and arbors for dining, was the most popular if not the most respectable. There was such an excess of eating and drinking, and medicine had made so little progress, that the fashionable found it good, at certain periods, to take the waters and live on restricted diet. Bath was the most famous health resort, though its elaborate social code, fine buildings, and elegant appointments did not come till after the advent of Beau Nash in 1705. The ordinary London citizen contented himself with Epsom, where for the past hundred years and more the Derby races have been held. There were many fields near the Capital where the lesser folk, particularly the apprentices, went for walks on evenings and holidays. In contrast to the upper classes, the working people kept very early hours,

[1] Written by City hacks to country magnates and to the inns of provincial towns and villages.

beginning the day at six or seven, dining at one, and going to bed at sunset.

Anglican Theology. — The drama, the choicest of the choice products of Elizabethan literature, began to decline at the end of the reign of James I, and, notwithstanding the appearance of poetry of enduring note, the remainder of the century was preëminently an age of prose: the growing Puritan spirit developed acute religious controversies, and pressing political problems claimed the energies of active minds. The Bible, in the magnificent King James version, became the dominating influence among the graver folk, high and low alike. It fostered independence of thought and stimulated the imagination even of the common man and prompted him to noble forms of expression, while it furnished a literary model of singular dignity and beauty for the man of letters, and provided an arsenal of weapons for the controversialist. Both in political and theological discussions there are hosts of names, some furious partisans only to be remembered in connection with the questions of the day, others whose productions have survived as literary classics.

The Latitudinarians. — In theology the golden mean was represented by the "Latitudinarians," who, clinging to the "sweet reasonableness" of Hooker, aimed to emphasize the essentials of faith and to minimize minor differences of dogma and Church policy, and to harmonize Divine revelation with nature, reason, and experience. Taking its rise in Holland, Latitudinarianism was promulgated chiefly by a small group of broad-minded thinkers who, on the eve of the Civil War, gathered round Lord Falkland, in his country house near Oxford. Their views were eagerly welcomed by numbers of moderate men who sought a middle way. Outside this group was Bishop Jeremy Taylor (1613–1667), who owed his early advancement to Laud and was a pronounced Royalist. His *Liberty of Prophesying* was intended to secure religious freedom against spiritual tyranny, though he is chiefly remembered for his *Holy Living* and *Holy Dying*, rare among devotional works for its profound human appeal and the splendor of its style. "Quaint old Tom Fuller" (1608–1661), beloved in his own day and by generations of readers in after times, for his sprightly wit and playful fancy, was among those who sought to steer a moderate course. His peculiar charm is best manifested in his *Worthies of England*.

The Latitudinarian tradition was continued by the "Cambridge Platonists," a small body of scholars at the University who, opposing the "sourness and severity" of the extreme Puritans on the one hand, and materialism on the other, advocated a sort of Christian

Platonism. They were mystics whose philosophic temper was held in check by spiritual humbleness. In the troubled days of the Interregnum and in the first years after the Restoration, the teaching and influence of the Cambridge Platonists was almost the one oasis in the educational aridity which prevailed at the Universities, where the students had to depend rather upon themselves than their tutors.[1] The principles of the early Latitudinarians and the Cambridge Platonists were preserved and developed by a long line of post-Restoration divines. As a body, the Latitudinarians enriched English theology with much good literature, they stood for peace in an age of bitter controversy, and for a toleration that was strange alike to the Laudians and their opponents. Moreover, they furnished examples of holy living only equaled by the best among the Puritans.

Philosophy. — Among the speculative thinkers of the period, the two greatest names are Thomas Hobbes (1588–1679) and John Locke (1632–1704). Hobbes, during his long and busy life, produced various works on ethics, metaphysics, and political philosophy. His chief contribution was the *Leviathan* (published 1657), in which he likens the State to the fabulous sea monster in the book of Job, and then to a mortal god who exercises absolute control over the subject. This power, in his opinion, rested upon an original social compact[2] between the people to obey the Sovereign in return for peace and protection against war and anarchy — the natural state of mankind. In addition, he insisted upon the complete subordination of the Church to the State. His doctrines were such as to expose him to furious attacks from the extremists of both the opposing camps. The Parliamentarians were alienated by his absolutism, while the Royalists, with their notions of the Divine Right of kings, would not accept his explanation of the origin of government. Moreover, he was denounced as an atheist who conformed to the Church of England merely because it was established by the State. However, his political theories have had far-reaching consequences. They were taken up by Rousseau and the French Encyclopedists who furnished the intellectual preparation for the French Revolution, while, furthermore, they profoundly influenced the English Utilitarians who contributed so much to popular progress during the nineteenth century. The mouthpiece of the Tory absolutists was Sir Robert Filmer, whose *Patriarcha*, or

[1] The pursuit of learning, however, as distinguished from teaching, was far from dead, particularly at Cambridge, since the University furnished many distinguished members to the Royal Society, which began to flourish early in the reign of Charles II.

[2] An ancient doctrine, long dormant, which had been recently revived by Hooker, Grotius, and others.

The Natural Power of Kings Asserted, was first published in 1680, twenty-seven years after the author's death. While agreeing naturally with Hobbes as to the supreme authority of the State, he sought its origin in the power of the patriarchs beginning with Adam, from whom the Divine Right of kings is derived by hereditary descent. But the only political thinker of the century to compare with Hobbes was Locke, a man of astonishing versatility. He drafted a constitution for the Carolinas; he had a share in the restoration of the coinage; he practiced medicine; and, according to John Stuart Mill, he was the "unquestioned founder of the analytic philosophy of the mind." His writings include four letters on *Toleration;* two *Treatises on Civil Government;* and an *Essay Concerning Human Understanding*. His political treatises are at once a reply to Filmer and a defense of the Revolution of 1688. Accepting the views of Hobbes as to the origin and end of government, he went beyond him in insisting upon the supremacy of the legislature as the voice of the people; the responsibilty of the prince to the subject; and the right of resistance when the governors of the State failed to observe their trust.

Economic Theory. — While the seventeenth century marked a considerable output of economic writing, most of the works were written for practical purposes and paid little attention to principles. Political economy as yet had no independent name; it was regarded merely as a branch of statecraft and business. The writers on the subject were, as a rule, merchants or politicians concerned with increasing the power, the treasure, the fisheries, and the shipping of the country. Chief among them was a group which was principally engaged in defending the privileges of the East India Company. Sir Josiah Child (1630–1699), who managed the affairs of the Company in the time of Charles II and James II, advanced many steps beyond his predecessors in economic thinking. He recognized that gold and silver were only commodities themselves though used as a measure of other commodities, and, while he defended monopoly on the ground that it made for national power if not for national wealth, he realized the commercial advantages of free trade. Though he succeeded in grasping some of the fundamental principles of political economy, he was primarily a shrewd, experienced business man who treated the subject as an art rather than a science. His slightly older contemporary, Sir William Petty (1623–1687) — a pioneer in advocating the use of statistics in economic studies — really contributed more toward exposing the fallacies of mercantilism. But perhaps the most advanced thinker among seventeenth century econo-

mists was Nicholas Barbon (1640–1698), who anticipated Adam Smith — the creator of modern political economy and the first great apostle of free trade — in defining such fundamental terms as the true nature of wealth. He further prepared the way for his great successor by developing the argument that restriction of imports meant restriction of exports as well.

Scientific Progress. — The early part of the seventeenth century was marked by two notable scientific achievements — the invention of logarithms by John Napier (1550–1617) and discovery of the circulation of the blood by William Harvey (1578–1657). These advances, however, were in striking contrast to the survival of popular superstitions, such as the belief in witchcraft shared by many eminent men, while scientific learning continued long in disrepute. Sir Walter Raleigh "was notoriously slandered to have enriched a school of atheism because he gave countenance to chemistry, to practical arts, and to curious mechanical operations, and designed to form the best of them into a college." The study of mathematics was not only much neglected but abhorred as a diabolical pursuit, so that when, in 1619, a professorship of geometry and astronomy was instituted at Oxford, many of the gentry refused to send their sons to the University lest they might be "smutted by the black art." But the dawn was beginning to break. Bacon did much for the advancement of experimental science, though more by what he suggested than by any achievements of his own. Then the work of Galileo and Kepler on the Continent in time produced its effect in England. A new scientific era was heralded by the establishment of the Royal Society for the promotion of "Physico-Mathematical Experimental Learning." Really started in 1645, it was incorporated under its present name in 1662. A distinctive feature of the Restoration was a new rationalism, a new scientific temper. Charles II and his boon companion, the versatile Buckingham, toyed with chemistry. The National Observatory was built at Greenwich, and signs of advance were manifested in various fields. Robert Boyle (1627–1691), one of the founders of the Royal Society, and "the father of modern chemistry," established the relation between volume and pressure of gases known as Boyle's Law. The great scientific genius of the age, however, and one of the greatest of any age, was Sir Isaac Newton (1641–1727), who made no less than three contributions to human knowledge — the discovery of the law of gravitation, the theory of fluxions or differential calculus, and the compound nature of white light. The former discovery, his supreme achievement, was made in 1666 and announced in his *Principia* in 1687.

Altogether, much was being done to wring secrets from "nature's close reserve."

Prose Literature. — In pure literature, the age is remarkable for a few rare products of scholarly leisure, as delightful in form as they are learned in content. Among them is the *Anatomy of Melancholy* of Robert Burton (1577–1640), a monument of erudition, abounding in fantastic reflections on men and things, and, strangely enough, considering the subject, permeated with whimsical humor. Sir Thomas Browne (1605–1682), a physician of Norwich, was a many-sided scholar who ranged over wider fields even than Burton. In his *Religio Medici*, his *Enquiries into Vulgar Errors*, and his *Urn Burial*, he displays not only vast knowledge and richness of imagination, but a pomp and magificence of diction rarely equaled in literature. Izaak Walton (1593–1683), an unpretentious London ironmonger, had a love of nature, a genius for friendship, a sweet simplicity and a cheery humor which are reflected in his *Compleat Angler* and in his lives of Hooker, and other contemporaries. John Bunyan (1628–1688), a humble self-educated tinsmith, while a prisoner in Bedford jail, wrote his immortal *Pilgrim's Progress* (1678), which stands among the world's great allegories. With a unique gift for direct, vivid narration and realistic character protrayal, as well as an inspired understanding of the spiritual needs and hopes and fears of the people among whom he lived, he embodied them in enduring form in a work which is at once a sublime religious tract and a forerunner of the modern novel.

Non-Dramatic Poetry. — While, as a whole, not so distinctive as the prose, the poetry of the period is noteworthy both in volume and character, and altogether too varied in type to be comprehended within any single generalization. John Donne (1573–1631) and George Herbert (1593–1633) were the earliest and leading representatives of the "Fantastic School" who essayed the formidable task of employing the poetic medium for interpreting profound metaphysical and religious problems. If, by their "conceits" or far-fetched images and analogies, they heightened the obscurity of their themes, and tended to become extravagant and bizarre, nevertheless, we owe to them passages of rare beauty, flashing light on spiritual aspiration and experience. While none of them were Puritans, the Puritan influence goes far to explain their earnestness and intensity. Then there were "essayists" in verse, who anticipated the prosaic poetry of the eighteenth century; also there was a group of Cavalier poets who flourished at the court of Queen Henrietta Maria, men of notoriously profligate lives, and whose verse was mostly on amatory subjects; and, finally, there were pas-

toral poets who continued their Spenserian tradition. Chiefly to be remembered of these latter is Robert Herrick (1591–1674). After a Bohemian youth he retired to a country parsonage where he wrote exquisite verses breathing forth the sweet air of the English countryside, reflecting the simple pleasures of rustic folk and ennobled at times with touches of delicate religious sentiment. In view of the prose and lyric poetry which appeared about the middle of the century, it cannot be said that either Puritanism or the Civil Wars stifled literary production.[1]

John Milton. — The finest flower of Puritan culture was John Milton, in whom the influences of the Renascence and the Reformation were strangely mingled; for he combined finished classical scholarship with a profound and reverent knowledge of the Bible. As an undergraduate at Cambridge he began to write Latin verses, and in 1629, the year in which he took his degree, appeared his splendid *Ode to the Nativity*. This was followed, in 1632, by *L'Allegro* and *Il Penseroso*, which contrast in exquisite lines the joyous mood of morning with the sadness of evening. The next year came his masque, *Comus*, a hauntingly beautiful double allegory of the perennial struggle of virtue against vice and of the pending conflict of the two parties in the State. His next notable publication was *Lycidas*, an elegy on the death of a college friend. Here, in the form of a pastoral saturated with mythical lore and perhaps the most perfect poem in the English language, he fiercely attacked the corruptions of the existing Establishment. As the Civil War approached he became increasingly serious, and, turning from poetry to prose, argued for religious and political freedom in language of harsh or impassioned eloquence. His *Areopagitica* (1644) is a noble plea for the liberty of the press, and his *Defensio pro Populo Anglicano* is regarded as the finest defense of the Commonwealth ever penned. While his prose writing is marred by want of method, by bitter partisanship, and occasionally by over-elaboration, his glowing enthusiasm for liberty, guided by Divine order, and the loftiness and magnificence of his best passages give his work a value far beyond any practical importance it may have had. From his youth up, he had contemplated the dedication of his poetic talents to the production of a great religious epic. After the Restoration, living in retirement, embittered by the failure of the cause he had espoused, by unhappy domestic experiences, by poverty

[1] Samuel Butler (1612–1680), during the years from 1663 to 1668, published his *Hudibras*, in which, detailing the adventures of a Puritan knight and his squire after the manner of Don Quixote, he bitterly ridicules the intolerance and hypocrisy which he seems to regard as typical of the party.

and blindness, he completed, between 1663 and 1667, his sublimest literary achievement, *Paradise Lost*. The vastness of the design and the marvelous harmony of the blank verse give it a place among the highest productions of the world's literature. Yet it is one of the works which all too many are content to admire from afar, rather than to read, and Milton received for it just £10. *Paradise Lost*, which deals with the temptation and fall of man, was followed in 1671 by *Paradise Regained*, which tells of man's redemption through Jesus Christ.

John Dryden (1631–1700). — The representative man of letters of the Restoration period was John Dryden, poet laureate and historiographer (1670–1689), who reflects in his verses his varying political and religious views; in them he bewailed the death of Cromwell, he welcomed the Restoration, he attacked the "Papists," he warmly defended Anglicanism, and, eventually, becoming converted to the Roman Catholic faith, he denounced the Church he had discarded, and eulogized the one he had adopted in one of his outstanding works — *The Hind and the Panther*, 1686. The best that can be said of him is, that after the Revolution of 1688, he made no attempt to gain the favor of the new Government by repudiating Roman Catholicism. His highest achievements were in satirical verse, a domain in which he has no peers among English writers. His keen and dexterous thrusts at his opponents have "damned them to everlasting fame." The best known of his political satires are *Absalom and Achitophel* and the *Medal*, directed mainly against Shaftesbury. He was, in addition, a busy and productive playwright, though not so pre-eminent in this field. His aim was to cater to the Court and the town, who, influenced by the French taste acquired by the Cavaliers in exile, craved novelty and scorned the great products of the Elizabethan and Jacobean age.

The Drama. — While the first thirty years of the century witnessed a constant succession of excellent plays, well acted and enthusiastically received by the public, a decline began to set in even during the decade preceding the Ordinance of September, 1642, closing the theaters. This was due, in some degree, to the aggressive hostility of the Puritans, who turned the soberer folk against the playhouses, and forced the dramatic authors to appeal more and more to the classes, both among the fashionable and the rabble, who were bound by no scruples of taste or morals. In the Restoration drama — one of the various manifestations of extravagant revolt against the recent Puritan régime — the Elizabethan spirit which the reign of the saints had helped to kill, was not revived. As in so many other fields, a new era of ex-

periment began. Tragedies in heroic couplets and prose comedies of wit and manners — both form and content markedly influenced by French models — took the place of the older tragedies and romantic comedies in blank verse. The French models were frequently immoral enough; but transformed into English dress, or rather undress, they were, all too often, insufferably coarse and cynical. For this Charles II and his courtiers were, to a large degree responsible, by making sensuality and cynicism the mark of a fine gentleman. The comedies, disagreeable as most of them are, have great historical value as reflections of contemporary life, especially of the upper classes in London, and because the prologues and epilogues were used, particularly by Dryden, for airing political animosities. Queen Mary, setting her face against the prevailing tendency, did something toward purifying the drama, and Jeremy Collier registered a vigorous protest in his *Short View of the Profaneness and Immorality of the English Stage*, 1698. Dryden admitted the justice of the rebuke, but improvement was slow. Real reform only came with the sentimental comedy initiated by Richard Steele.

Art, Architecture, and Music. — While pride of ancestry prompted many to employ Dutch and Flemish artists to execute family portraits, and while there were collectors, including Charles I, of no mean repute, there was, nevertheless, no general appreciation of art among seventeenth-century Englishmen. Nor, except in miniatures, were there any native portrait painters of real note. Of foreign artists in England, the most famous were Rubens (1577–1640) and Vandyke (1599–1641). The former, during a brief sojourn, painted several portraits and received an order for the decoration of Whitehall. The latter remained in England most of the time from 1632 till his death. He was appointed Court painter and executed several fine pictures of Charles I and his family, as well as of prominent men of the time. Cromwell, who was fond both of music and painting, had an official painter, though, in addition, he gave his patronage to the more famous Peter Lely (1618–1680). Charles II inherited none of his father's taste for art, but Lely became his Court painter and is famous for his portraits of the royal favorites.

In architecture, the century was dominated by Inigo Jones (1573–1652) and Christopher Wren (1632–1723). This fact marks a significant departure from the traditions of the Middle Ages, when the style and not the man was the distinguishing factor. Jones was profoundly influenced by the Italian Palladio, notable for his composite adaptation of the ancient Doric, Ionic, and Corinthian forms. Almost no new churches were built during the first half of the century; but Jones did

much in the way of restoring ecclesiastical edifices and public buildings. Wren, his famous successor, was active as an architect from 1663 to 1718. The fire of London gave him an opportunity to rebuild St. Paul's, as well as about fifty parish churches. Chief among the other works of his long and busy life is the Royal Hospital at Greenwich. Unfortunately, his two principal buildings do not show him at his best; for St. Paul's was not completed according to his original designs, while Greenwich Hospital was decidedly marred by the architect who succeeded him.

With the striking exception of Cromwell, the Puritans were notoriously hostile to music. Charles II, in contrast to his indifference to other forms of art, was an enthusiastic patron of music, and Henry Purcell (1658–1695), recognized as England's greatest musical genius, came to the front in his reign. His famous grand opera *Dido and Eneas* (1675) was the first ever written to an English poem; but his supreme achievements were in Church music.

Final Summary of the Period. — Thus, aside from epoch-making political events, the century was a notable one. It witnessed the later plays of Shakespeare as well as those of Ben Jonson, and hosts of other dramatists; the writings of Milton, and of innumerable poets besides; compositions in stately prose of men of letters and divines; treatises on political philosophy, trade, and economics; and, what was big in future results, the foundation stones of empire were laid in America and in India.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

General Conditions. Traill, *Social England*, IV. Trevelyan, *England under the Stuarts*, chs. I, II, an admirable picture of the life of the upper and lower classes in the early Stuart period. Macaulay, I, ch. III, a famous description of conditions in the Restoration period. W. E. Sydney, *Social Life in England*, 1660–1690 (1892).

Social and Industrial. Cunningham, *English Industry and Commerce*. Unwin, *Social and Industrial Organization*. Rogers, *Agriculture and Prices*, V, VI. W. A. Hewins, *English Trade and Finance, chiefly in the Seventeenth Century* (1892). Elizabeth Godfrey, *Home Life under the Stuarts* (1903) and *Social Life under the Stuarts* (1904). A. H. Hamilton, *Quarter Sessions from Elizabeth to Anne* (1878) relates chiefly to Devonshire. Lady Verney, *Memoirs of the Verney Family* (4 vols., 1892–1899). H. B. Wheatley, *Samuel Pepys and the World He Lived In* (1880). Rose M. Bradley, *The English Housewife in the XVII and XVIII Centuries* (1913). Eleanor Trotter, *Seventeenth Century Life in the Country Parish* (1919).

Literary and Intellectual. Moody and Lovett; Taine; Jusserand and *Cambridge History of Literature*. Lodge, *Political History*, ch. XX. *Cam-*

bridge Modern History, IV, ch. XXVI, V, chs. III, VI, XXIII (bibliographies IV, 948–950, V, 775–779, 799–808, 903–910). E. Dowden, *Puritan and Anglican* (1900). Masson, *Milton;* the standard work. There are short *Lives* of Milton by Mark Pattison (1879, 1906) and Sir Walter Raleigh (1900). See also Macaulay's essay on Milton. Saintsbury, *Dryden* (1881, 1902).

Religion and Church. Hutton and Wakeman as above. J. Hunt, *Religious Thought in England* (3 vols., 1870). J. H. Overton, *Life in the English Church*, 1660–1714 (1885). Babington, *Mr. Macaulay's Character of the Clergy* (1849). Tatham, *The Puritans in Power. Cambridge Modern History*, chs. XI, XXIV (bibliography, 838–839, 911–917).

Contemporary. Pepys's *Diary;* Evelyn's *Diary;* R. Baxter, *Narrative of the Most Memorable Passages of His Life and Times* (ed. M. Sylvester, 1696); and George Fox, *Journal* (1694, ed. W. Armistead, 2 vols., 1852) a great spiritual autobiography.

Political philosophy. Sir Robert Filmer, *Patriarcha, or the Natural Power of Kings* (1680, ed. 1903, introd. by Henry Morley). Thomas Hobbes, *The Leviathan* (ed. A. R. Waller, 1904). John Locke, *Two Treatises on Civil Government* (1903, introd. by Henry Morley). G. P. Gooch, *Political Thought in England from Bacon to Halifax* (1914). H. J. Laski, *English Political Thought from Locke to Bentham.* (Home University Library.)

CHAPTER XXXVI

THE EARLY YEARS OF THE NEW DYNASTY AND THE OPENING OF THE GREAT WAR. WILLIAM AND MARY (1689–1694)

The Significance of the Reign of William and Mary. — The reign of William is significant from the fact that, as "the champion of Protestantism and the liberties of Europe against French ascendancy," he plunged England into a whirlpool of European war and diplomacy from which she emerged as the leading Colonial and Sea Power of the world. The internal progress of the period is also noteworthy. Fundamental constitutional questions were defined and settled: the order of succession was regulated in the Bill of Rights and in the Act of Settlement which supplemented it; a Toleration Act was passed; the National Debt was funded; the Bank of England was established; the censorship of the press came to an end; procedure in treason trials was reformed; and Cabinet and party government began to take modern shape. This last point is of peculiar importance, because the machinery of the English Cabinet and party system is the most perfect which has yet been devised for speedily and peacefully voicing the will of the people and because it is the system which has been adopted, with more or less variation, by the chief European governments in recent times. It is essentially a government by an executive committee of Parliament whose members represent and are responsible to the majority party of the House of Commons, which, in its turn, represents the qualified voters of the country.

The Reaction against William (1689). — In spite of the joy manifested at his accession, a reaction against William soon set in. It was due, partly to the King's own character and policy, partly to the nature of the situation. He was cold and unsympathetic, he loved Dutchmen and Dutch ways, he distrusted Englishmen and chafed at his necessary residence in England as a joyless exile. Patient and courageous in great matters, he was irritable and impatient of opposition in little things, while his manners left much to be desired. Then his policy was a disappointment to the Whigs who had led the movement to place

him on the throne; for he was no friend of popular liberty and had ousted James primarily to break up the royal alliance with France and to secure English resources for his great work. Furthermore, he had to face a most difficult situation; for impelled by a common fear of James, the most diverse elements had combined momentarily to support him. Truly, Englishmen and Dutchmen, Whigs and Tories, Churchmen and Nonconformists made strange bedfellows. The English and the Dutch were old trade rivals who had been three times at war within half a century. The Whigs stood for a limited monarchy and toleration, and had old scores to settle with the party who had oppressed them during the reign of Charles II and the early years of James II. The Tories, who stood for Divine hereditary right and an exclusive Establishment, directly the excitement was over, came to be ashamed of the part they had taken in expelling the Lord's anointed. Many of the Whigs, too, were dissatisfied, some because they felt themselves insufficiently rewarded, others because their advice in ordering public affairs was neither sought nor heeded. Although the really disaffected were in a minority, they were so vociferous and busy that they might have caused serious trouble but for the fact that Louis XIV, by undertaking to restore James by force, and with the aid of the dreaded Irish into the bargain, forced the moderates of both parties to cling to William. In selecting his first Ministry, he sought to balance parties, though in view of the critical situation abroad, and the particular interests which he had at stake, he took charge of foreign affairs himself.

The Mutiny Act (1689). — The mutiny of an English regiment at Ipswich, in the first year of the reign, led to the passage of a measure which was bound, in any case, to have come before long; since, according to the existing law, there were no adequate means of dealing with such crises. The Mutiny Act, which began by declaring courts martial and military discipline illegal, conferred upon William the authority to provide for the exercise of such extraordinary jurisdiction for six months. Later the Act was regularly renewed, but never for longer than a year. It is now called the Army Act.

The Toleration Act (1689). — Also in this eventful year, the Protestant Dissenters for the first time obtained legal recognition and toleration. William, a Calvinist by training but a Latitudinarian by conviction, was a prime mover; however, he had the solid backing of a growing rationalistic opinion, voiced by Locke in his *Letters on Toleration*, in which he argued that the State had no right to interfere with the way men might choose to worship. Furthermore, certain influential Tories felt under obligation to redeem the promises they had made

to Dissenters in order to detach them from James II. The Toleration Act of 1689, while it did not repeal the existing penal laws, suspended their operation against those who absented themselves from the services of the Established Church and attended other places of worship, provided they took the Oath of Allegiance and Supremacy and subscribed to a declaration against transubstantiation. Quakers, who scrupled to take oaths, were allowed to hold their assemblies undisturbed on condition of signing the declaration against transubstantiation, making a confession of Christian belief, and promising fidelity to the Government. "Papists," and those who did not believe in the Trinity,[1] were expressly excluded from the benefits of the Act. Although the toleration thus granted was far from complete, "it removed a vast mass of evil without shocking a vast mass of prejudice."

The Bill of Rights (1689). — After a recess of two months, the old Convention met for its second session, 19 October, 1689. The chief work of the session was to turn the Declaration of Right into a bill. A few new provisions were introduced. One provided that any Sovereign professing the "popish" religion should be incapable of reigning in England, and, in case he married a "Papist," his subjects were to be absolved from their allegiance; but no attempt was made to define the term, nor was any machinery devised for carrying the provision into effect. Furthermore, the dispensing power, which according to the Declaration was illegal only "as it hath been exercised of late," was now done away with altogether.[2]

The Settlement of the Revenue (1690.) — In a new Parliament which met 20 March, 1690, the Commons, after some discussion, voted that William should have, in addition to the hereditary Crown revenue amounting to £400,000 a year, the income from the excise, which yielded some £300,000 annually. This sum, about £700,000 in the aggregate, which came to be known as the Civil List,[3] was to be devoted to the maintenance of the royal household, the payment of civil officials, and in general, to the non-military expenses of the State. The income from the customs, variously estimated between £400,000 and £600,000, was granted only for four years. Although the outbreak of the war necessitated the grant of extraordinary supplies, Parliament adhered to the principle that a fixed amount only should be allowed to the King

[1] *I.e.* Jews and Socinians, the latter forerunners of the Unitarians.

[2] At least, that was the result, for it was provided that exceptions might be enumerated during the session, and none were made into law.

[3] Later, Parliament took over the payment of all public expenses, leaving to the Sovereign merely the maintenance of the royal household. The income which he has for this purpose is still, curiously enough, known as the Civil List.

for the ordinary needs of the State. Moreover, in the future all grants were appropriated for specified purposes. Thus the principle of appropriation of supply[1] foreshadowed in the reigns of James I and Charles II became a regular practice.

James Appears in Ireland (March, 1689). — The attempts of James, through Tyrconnel, to make Ireland a Roman Catholic stronghold, the transfer of the administration into the hands of the members of that faith, and rumors even of a general massacre had thrown the Protestants into a panic. Many fled to England, others prepared to defend themselves. Tyrconnel, while he dallied with the terms offered by William, hastened to gather his forces, seized cattle and supplies, and sent for James. Meantime, he succeeded in reducing all Ireland except Ulster, which contained the bulk of the Protestant element. Many of the latter fled for refuge to Londonderry and Enniskillen, leaving their lands and goods at the mercy of their exultant and infuriated enemies. James arrived in Dublin, 24 March, 1689. Although Louis refused him an army, partly because he distrusted his abilities, partly because he needed his troops at home, he gave him a fleet, together with arms, money and officers to drill the Irish.

The Irish Parliament. — The Irish Parliament which met 7 May, 1689, was dominated by extremists, men devoid of experience in public affairs and burning to avenge the wrongs of their religion and their race. James succeeded in passing a Toleration Act; but he was obliged to consent to a series of measures calculated to alienate utterly his English supporters. The authority of the English Parliament was repudiated. The tithes of the Roman Catholics were transferred to their own clergy and the Act of Settlement was repealed. All lands forfeited in consequence of the Rebellion of 1641 were restored, and a famous Act of Attainder was passed, comprising over 2000 names. The property of these included on the list was appropriated forthwith, and though the owners were ordered to appear for trial before a certain date to prove their innocence, it was at the risk of being hanged, drawn and quartered, in the event of almost certain conviction.

The Siege and Relief of Londonderry. Newton Butler (1689). — Already, 19 April, 1689, the siege of Londonderry had begun. Threatened with starvation, and exposed to constant attacks against the weak walls of the city, the dauntless garrison held out with grim determination for one hundred and five days, until they were finally relieved by Colonel Kirke, who had shown far more celerity and vigor in hunting down the poor peasants involved in the Monmouth rebel-

[1] In conjunction with the Mutiny Act it insured, for the future, annual sessions of Parliament.

lion than he displayed against the troops of James. The joyous news of the relief of Londonderry was immediately followed by the tidings that the men of Enniskillen had saved themselves by repulsing an attacking force at Newton Butler, 2 August. Reënforcements under Schomberg arrived the same month, but his army, consisting largely of raw recruits, was in no condition to fight. What with heavy autumn rains and bad food, supplied by greedy and dishonest English contractors, a pestilence broke out. He was obliged to go into winter quarters, while the mass of Englishmen, who did not understand the situation, howled at his inaction and at the sufferings to which his troops were exposed. Such was the situation when William started for Ireland in June, 1690.

The Battle of Beachy Head (29 June, 1690). — Scarcely had he gone when a French fleet appeared in the Channel. Admiral Torrington, of the combined English and Dutch fleet, was so unprepared that he dared not fight, and retreated up the English coast, until he received positive orders from the Queen to engage. On 29 June, 1690, he was defeated at Beachy Head, after which he continued to retreat and took refuge in the Thames. The Dutch were furious because he had put their ships where they had to bear the brunt of the fighting. At a court martial, subsequently held, it developed their own recklessness was to blame, and Torrington was acquitted, though he never received another command. Truly it was an anxious time for Englishmen. The Channel was left undefended, the country was swarming with Jacobites, while, to cap all, news arrived that the French had won a victory in the Netherlands. Fortunately, however, the sudden fear that Louis XIV might send over an invading army from Dunkirk was enough to unite practically the whole country in defense of the crown. Many, who wanted to see James restored, had no desire to see it done at the cost of a great national humiliation. The prospect was still dark enough when William sent back word of a notable victory.

The Battle of the Boyne (1 July, 1690). — In the famous battle of the Boyne, which took place 1 July, the English scattered their foes in the utmost confusion, in spite of the stubborn resistance of the Irish cavalry. James, who had lost the bravery of his youthful days, watched the fighting from a safe distance, hurried away as soon as he foresaw the result, and speedily sailed for France. The French fleet which had cruised along the English coast unopposed after the Battle of Beachy Head met with a hot reception on attempting to land troops, the militia were everywhere mustered; indeed, it was not long before all England "was up in arms on foot and on horseback . . . and rang

...th shouts of 'God bless King William and Mary.'" The chief result of the attempted invasion was to undo the work of English Jacobites.

The Siege and Treaty of Limerick (1691). — After the Battle of the Boyne the bulk of the Irish army took refuge at Limerick. William, failing to take the town by assault, 17 August, was soon forced to raise the siege, owing to heavy rains and lack of powder. He himself returned to England; but the garrison finally capitulated to his army, 3 October, 1691. Two treaties were framed. By a military treaty, it was provided that all officers who desired should be transported to France. In a civil treaty, the Roman Catholics of Ireland received a promise that they "should enjoy such privileges in the exercise of their religion as were consistent with the law, or as they had enjoyed in the reign of Charles II." The bulk of the soldiery elected to go to France; many afterwards deserted, but numbers won high distinction in the ensuing wars. Those who remained in Ireland were so cowed that the country was free from formidable insurrection for over a century.

The Violation of the Treaty of Limerick. — Unhappily, England did not temper her victory with mercy or wisdom, but allowed intolerance, greed, and oppression to prevail. A new statute was passed by the Parliament at Westminster, not only excluding Roman Catholics from office, but enacting for the first time that they could not sit in the Irish Parliament. That body, consisting henceforth of the representatives of the Protestant minority, passed laws, in 1695, providing that no "Popish" teacher should be allowed in schools or private houses, forbidding "Papists" to carry arms or to own a horse worth more than £5. In 1697, in distinct violation of the Treaty of Limerick, all Roman Catholic prelates were banished from the kingdom and Roman Catholics and Protestants were forbidden to intermarry. These were the forerunners of a penal code which was carried to completion in the three following reigns. Every inducement was offered to informers and to those who would desert the faith of their fathers; for example, in the inheritance of property the nearest Roman Catholic heirs were passed over in favor of the more remote, provided they were Protestants. All that can be said is that the more ferocious laws were seldom enforced. Added to the religious restrictions, binding shackles were imposed on Irish industry and commerce. The Irish were excluded from the English colonial trade, and by an Act of 1699 the export of their wool and woolen goods was practically prohibited. Such tyranny and avarice on the part of the Protestant minority slowly but surely bore bitter fruit.

The Revolution in Scotland, and the Rising of the Highland Clans. — The Revolution in Scotland was not accomplished without excitement, disorder and even a brief period of war. A Convention Parliament which met in Edinburgh 24 March, 1689, having voted that James by his misdeeds had forfeited the government, named William and Mary as his successors. The forces of opposition, however, were various and vehement; but the only serious armed revolt came from the Highlanders. This picturesque and beautiful region was then, to the mass of Englishmen, and even to the Lowland Scots, an unknown country, described by the few who had dared to penetrate its rugged mountains and bleak moorlands as a grim, unlovely waste, inhabited by savage tribes, utterly ignorant of the ways of civilization and regardless of life and the laws of property. Their southern neighbors, who knew them as cattle stealers and murderous enemies, were as little acquainted with their virtues — their courage, their hospitality, their dignity and their devotion to clan and family — as they were with the beauties of their scenery. Thither, Viscount Dundee, formerly known as Graham of Claverhouse, sought recruits, after he had fled from the Whig-dominated Parliament at Edinburgh. The clans pressed to join him, not so much out of attachment for the Stuart cause as from hatred of the Campbells, whose chief, the Marquis of Argyle, had taken the side of William, though another motive was the prospect of fighting and plunder. They mustered in May, 1689, at Lochaber. Dundee's difficulties were enormous. Each clan was a unit in itself. Many nourished long-standing feuds and jealousies, the chiefs were proud and sensitive, so that it was next to impossible to weld the discordant elements into an army. However, he succeeded in eluding for weeks Hugh Mackay, the commander sent against him. At length, the two armies met in the pass of Killiekrankie, 27 July. Mackay was driven from the pass and retreated over the mountains to Stirling; but the victory of the Highlanders was more than offset by the death of Dundee, who was shot during the triumphant charge. Mackay soon rallied his men,[1] but the Highlanders had lost the only man who could hold them together. Before the end of August the whole force had dispersed to their homes.

The Massacre of Glencoe (1692). — Unhappily, William's triumph was marred by a brutal crime, due to his carelessness or indifference, to the vindictiveness of the Campbells, and the desire of the Master

[1] Mackay's defeat led him to make a contribution to the art of war by inventing the modern bayonet, fixed outside of instead of fitting into the gun barrel. He attributed the loss of the battle largely to the fact that his men, after they fired, could not attach their bayonets quickly enough to meet the charging Highlanders.

of Stair, the King's chief adviser, to root out the most unyielding of the clans. A proclamation was issued from Edinburgh offering pardon to every rebel who, before 31 December, 1691, should swear to live peaceably under William and Mary. The chief of the Macdonalds of Glencoe[1] waited stubbornly until the very last day, when he presented himself before an official not empowered to take an oath, who sent him with a letter to the sheriff of Argyleshire. The sheriff after some hesitation accepted the submission and forwarded the certificate to Edinburgh, 6 January. This the Master of Stair suppressed, after which he secured William's signature to an order authorizing the extermination of the clan. On 1 February a company of soldiers was dispatched to Glencoe, where they stayed for nearly two weeks enjoying the rude but plentiful hospitality of the clan. Suddenly, in the early morning of the 13th, they rose and began to massacre their hosts. But they made the mistake of shooting instead of stabbing their victims, while the troops detailed to block the exits of the glen failed to arrive in time, so that a majority escaped. Many of them, however, perished of exposure, their homes were set on fire, and their cattle driven off. Stair's only regret was that so many got away. His enemies, however, and the opponents of the Government raised such an outcry that William, though he regarded the deed as a wholesome example visited on a gang of thieves and outlaws, was forced to consent to a commission of inquiry. Stair was retired and remained in private life till the next reign.

The Alliance against France (1689). — Meantime, William, in the autumn of 1689, had completed an alliance against France on which he had been laboriously working for years. It included the Empire, Spain, England and the Dutch. After his authority had been established in Ireland and Scotland, he departed, 18 January, 1691, to meet the allies in a congress at the Hague. Though his combination seemed an overwhelming one, it had almost no cohesion. Each of the Powers, determined on giving as little and getting as much as possible, counted on leaving the Dutch and English to bear the brunt of the fighting and the expense. They quarreled with one another about points of precedence, they were separated by trade rivalries and religious differences, while Louis, fighting on inside lines, was master of the resources of his Kingdom, and, ably assisted by Louvois, the greatest War Minister, Luxemburg, the greatest general, and Vauban, the greatest engineer of the age, could direct singly and unopposed the operations of his armies.

[1] Meaning literally Glen of Weeping. It was a dreary inaccessible spot on the western coast.

The Dismissal of Marlborough. — William had not only to manage his allies and to keep up their enthusiasm but to face one Jacobite plot after another. No less than three whom he regarded as trusty supporters entered into treasonable negotiations with the enemy. Marlborough [1] went to the greatest lengths; for he actually intrigued with the Jacobites to get rid of William, with the ultimate aim of putting not James, but Anne, in his place. The Jacobites, becoming suspicious, disclosed his designs, which led William to dismiss him, 10 January, 1692. It was a serious loss that, throughout the war, he was deprived of the aid of one destined to prove himself in the next reign the most remarkable of England's generals.

The Victory of La Hogue, 1692. — Early in 1692, James, counting on his popularity with the navy and the discontent of Russell, who commanded the Channel fleet, prepared an invasion of England. Having assembled a fleet and mustered an army to be transported to the English coast, he issued a stupid and ill-timed declaration, in which he not only expressed no regret for the past and gave no promises for the future, but breathed dire vengeance against all who should oppose his return, and even published a list of those whom he had marked out for punishment. Indeed, it was so damning that the English Government had it licensed and freely distributed, which proceeding, together with the prospect of attack, roused the intensest patriotism. Russell, who, though in a fit of dissatisfaction at the grants he had received from William, had corresponded with the enemy, was a stanch Whig and zealous for the fame of the English navy, and declared: "Do not think that I will let the French triumph over us in our own sea . . . if I meet them, I fight them, aye, though his Majesty himself should be on board." So, when their fleet appeared in the Channel, they were met by a combined force of the English and the Dutch, who drove the French ships back to the Norman coast and burned the bulk of them in the harbor of La Hogue, before the very face of James and his army, 19–24 May.

William's Loss of Namur and Defeat at Steenkerke (1692). — The triumph at La Hogue, however, was more than counterbalanced by William's reverses in the Netherlands — his loss, in June, of Namur, commanded by a citadel never before taken, and his defeat by Luxemburg, 3 August, at Steenkerke on the road from Namur to Brussels. When the King returned to England in October, after narrowly escaping an attempt on his life hatched in the French War Office, the situation was altogether discouraging. English merchantmen were suffering from the pillaging of the enemy's privateers, the harvest had failed,

[1] John Churchill had been created Earl of Marlborough at the coronation.

owing to heavy rains, and the insecurity and discontent were aggravated by a startling increase of crime. Housebreakers and footpads were so bold and active that William had to detail cavalry to guard the roads to London and to take the sternest measures to put down disorder. Having, with the greatest difficulty, secured supplies for the coming campaign from a Parliament torn by faction, he started back for the Netherlands 24 March, 1693.

William's Defeat at Neerwinden (19 July, 1693). — This year the allied army took a strongly intrenched position where Luxemburg attacked it, 19 July. The battle of Neerwinden — or Landen, as it is sometimes called from a neighboring village — the bloodiest battle of the century and one of the most terrible ever fought in the Netherlands, resulted in another defeat for William. But Luxemburg, though he drove him from the field, did not follow him up, either because his forces were too crippled or because he lacked energy. William, with the wonderful power of recovery for which he was famous, rallied his forces at Brussels, and ended the year's campaign in a position fully as strong as when it began.

The Failure of the Expedition to Brest. English Successes in the Mediterranean, 1694. — The French plan of war for 1694 was to concentrate its energies in the Mediterranean against England's Spanish ally. The English, on their part, planned to send out two naval expeditions, one against Brest, the other to the Mediterranean. The destination of the first was betrayed by Marlborough, who can by no means be exonerated on the ground that the secret had already been disclosed. He apparently had a double motive; to secure himself in case William's enemies triumphed, and to discredit his ablest rival, who was in command. The expedition, delayed by contrary winds in the bargain, failed in its object, and accomplished nothing beyond devastating a few undefended points along the French coast. Russell, however, who went to the Mediterranean, was able to save Barcelona from an attack of a combined French army and fleet and to force them to take refuge under the guns of Toulon. His success marked another step in the rise of the English sea power, and, by checking Louis XIV's Spanish designs, exercised an effective influence on the subsequent course of the war.

The Death of Queen Mary (28 December, 1694). — On 28 December, 1694, Queen Mary died of smallpox at the early age of thirty-two. By her marriage with William of Orange she became a great factor in frustrating the designs of James II and checking the growing ascendancy of Louis XIV. She had endeared herself to the Dutch, and her popularity with the English went far to soften the animosity against

her sour Consort and his Dutch favorites. The King's grief at her loss was terrible, though he had only tardily come to appreciate her devotion, especially after she had readily renounced her rights to the throne that he might be the more a King.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

Narrative. Lodge; Trevelyan; Macaulay; Ranke; and *Cambridge Modern History.*

Constitutional. Maitland, *English Constitutional History*, period IV; Hallam; Taswell-Langmead; and Taylor. Mary T. Blauvelt, *The Development of Cabinet Government* (1902), a good brief sketch. For scholarly treatments of the origin and growth of the Cabinet, see H. W. V. Temperly and Sir Wm. Anson, *English Historical Review*, XXVII, 682 ff. and XXIX, 56–78, and E. R. Turner, *American Historical Review*, XVIII, 751–768, XIX, 27–43. A. S. Turberville, *The House of Lords in the Reign of William III* (1913).

Army and Navy. Fortescue; Clowes; Mahan, *Sea Power;* and Corbett, *England in the Mediterranean*, I.

Scotland and Ireland. P. H. Brown; Turner and Joyce. For a full bibliography, see *Cambridge Modern History*, V, 825–837.

Special. Seeley, *British Policy* and *The Expansion of England* (1895), a luminous treatment.

Contemporary. Burnet.

Church. Hutton; Wakeman; and Stoughton.

Selections from the sources. Adams and Stephens, nos. 235–240. Robertson, *Select Statutes*, pt. I, nos. XII–XVII.

CHAPTER XXXVII

THE COMPLETION OF THE REVOLUTION OF 1688. WILLIAM ALONE (1694–1702)

The Assassination Plot (1695–1696), and the Attainder of Fenwick (1697). — The death of Mary, by breaking one of the strongest links between William and the English people, revived the hopes of the Jacobites, who planned another attempt to restore James, this time by means of an assassination plot, later coupled with a scheme for raising an insurrection assisted by an invasion from France. However, the Duke of Berwick, a natural son of James, who came to England in January, 1696, to prepare the way for the projected invasion, failed to induce the Jacobites to rise, while, in February, a design to intercept and kill the King was betrayed. Most of the conspirators were arrested, though, owing to the King's wise forbearance, only eight were put to death. Among them was Sir John Fenwick, who while implicated in the projected insurrection, seems to have had nothing to do with the attempt to murder his Sovereign. He was executed, 28 January, 1697, after conviction by Bill of Attainder, the last man in England to suffer by this process.

The Restoration of the Coinage (1696). — Meantime, the great war was drawing to a close. During 1695, William had succeeded in recovering Namur, but in the campaign of 1696 the movements of both armies were hampered by lack of money. France was reduced to a state of downright misery, and England was suffering from a temporary financial stringency, due largely to a restoration of the currency. In spite of severe penalties, old clipped and mutilated coins circulated freely, while new ones with milled edges were hoarded or melted down and sold as bullion. The evil was bound to continue so long as those under weight were accepted at their face value. Through the efforts of four remarkable men, John Locke, Lord Somers, Charles Montagu, and Sir Isaac Newton, a Recoinage Act was passed, January, 1696, and carried into effect, which provided that the old damaged coins should cease to be legal tender by 4 May. The Government agreed

to replace, at their face value, old coins that were turned in; but, though the new issue was made with unprecedented rapidity, it did not come fast enough at first to supply the place of the money drawn from circulation. It was not till March, 1697, that the crisis was past.

The Peace of Ryswick (1697). — In order to consider overtures of peace made by Louis XIV a congress of the allies assembled 9 May, 1697, at Ryswick, but it occupied so much time in ceremonious display and trifling points of precedence that William, heartily disgusted, decided to open negotiations with Louis on his own account. Accordingly, in June, he sent a trusted agent to confer privately with a representative selected by the French King, with the result that before the end of July they had settled all the terms in which England and France were concerned, while the Congress was still wrangling over tedious formalities. So, 20/30 September, 1697, in spite of the protests of James, the Treaty of Ryswick was signed by England, France, the United Provinces, and Spain. According to the terms of the peace, William was acknowledged as King of England with Anne as his successor, and Louis promised not to aid in plots against him. All conquests made during the war were restored, though Louis was allowed to retain certain places which he had "reunited"[1] since 1678, and the chief fortresses in the Netherlands were garrisoned with Dutch troops as a barrier against France. The Emperor thus isolated made peace with France, 30 October. In spite of notable victories, Louis had been checked for the first time in his victorious career, and had been forced to acknowledge William in place of James, thus completing the Revolution of 1688.

Internal Progress in England. A New Financial Era. — During the years that war raged on the Continent, a series of measures were passed in England of far-reaching importance in financial, economic, political and legal developments. Louis, during the late war, had declared that the Power with the last gold piece would win, and it was due in a large degree to the effective financial organization begun in this period that England gained her successes in the great European conflicts of the eighteenth century. Moreover, it resulted in the ascendancy of the Whigs and the permanence of the Revolution settlement. The moneyed classes — the merchants and traders — belonged mainly to the Whig party, which grew in strength and influence as the State turned to it more and more for loans. Then, naturally, men who had invested their funds under the existing Government would struggle to uphold it; since the return of James meant repudiation of the debts which it had contracted.

[1] *I.e.* appropriated on the ground that they had once belonged to France.

The Beginnings of the National Debt (1693). — The new policy was chiefly the work of a remarkable politician and financier, Charles Montagu (1665–1715), created Baron and later Earl of Halifax. At the very beginning of King William's War it became evident that, in spite of new and increased taxes, the annual revenue was insufficient to cover expenses. On the other hand, there was a surplus of capital in the country and few opportunities of placing it safely and profitably. Many were reduced to hoarding their savings in strong boxes or burying them in the ground. In consequence, stock jobbers and fraudulent companies, with all sorts of speculative schemes, began to multiply alarmingly. There were, for instance, a Royal Academies Company for the education of young gentlemen in every branch of human learning, and a Diving Company to recover lost treasure from the sea, to mention only two. Profiting by the example of Italy, France and the Netherlands which had long had permanent debts, Montagu determined to secure for the use of the Government some of the surplus capital which was lying idle or being wasted in futile speculations. To that end, he framed a measure which became law in January, 1693, for borrowing £1,000,000. The subscribers were to receive life annuities of 10 per cent till 1700 and 7 per cent after that date. Such was the beginning of the National Debt.

The Foundation of the Bank of England (1694). — Neither the loan of 1693, nor various new devices which were tried, proved adequate to meet the constantly swelling expenses of the war, whereupon Montagu adopted another expedient — the founding of the Bank of England. Already, in the reign of Charles II, men had begun to intrust their money to the goldsmiths, who had special facilities for the safekeeping of the precious metals which they employed in their business. The depositors received notes which they circulated in their transactions, while the goldsmiths frequently let out at interest the funds intrusted to their care. In this way the banking business in England began. Before the close of Charles's reign the question of a national bank commenced to be discussed. At Genoa there had been such an institution for almost three centuries, and there was a bank of Amsterdam nearly a hundred years old. The plan adopted by Montagu was based on a scheme by William Paterson, a Scot, soon to attain unenviable notoriety. The new project provided that the Government should borrow £1,200,000 at 8 per cent, and that the subscribers should be incorporated as the "Governor and Company of the Bank of England," with authority to engage in private banking, to borrow and lend upon security and to deal in bullion and bills of exchange. The Bank could also issue notes, — a privilege in which,

for exceptional services, it secured a monopoly in 1697, though such notes were not legal tender.

The Triennial Act (1694). — An attempt at parliamentary reform resulted in a new Triennial Act in 1694. The Act of 1641 had been primarily concerned to secure frequent Parliaments, but the practice of passing the Mutiny Act and of appropriating supplies annually had rendered a precaution of this sort no longer necessary. A crying evil, however, was the corruption and bribery which had come to flourish so rankly. If members were only called to account by their constituents at long and infrequent intervals, they were bound to barter their votes all the more readily. By the Triennial Act of 1694, the duration of Parliament was limited to three years.

The Act Regulating Trials for Treason (1696). — While the Habeas Corpus Act had made it difficult to hold accused persons in prison without cause and while juries were no longer answerable for verdicts contrary to the wishes of the Government,[1] the case of a prisoner brought before the courts was grievous. He was not shown a copy of his indictment before the trial, and so did not know of what he was accused until he appeared at the bar. He had no power to compel the attendance of witnesses, nor to force such as came to testify under oath, and he was denied the benefit of counsel. After the Tories had got a taste of what the Whigs and Nonconformists had long suffered, they began to join in seeking a remedy. The result was a bill for regulating trials in cases of high treason, which finally became law in 1696. Its main provisions were: that no person could be convicted of a treason committed more than three years before the indictment was found, that every person accused of high treason might be allowed the benefit of counsel; that he should be furnished with a copy of the indictment at least five days before the trial, and a list from which the jury was to be taken; that his witnesses should be sworn; that they should be cited by the same process as those summoned against him; and that there must be for conviction two witnesses to the same overt act or to two related acts of the same treason.[2]

The End of the Censorship of the Press (1695). — Meantime, a long step had been taken toward the emancipation of the Press. For a good while, the Government had sought to muzzle the expression of public opinion by a strict censorship over all printed matter. Nothing could be published without a license, and the official censor exercised a wide and oppressive discretion. Milton, in the *Areopagitica*, made

[1] Decided in Bushel's case, 1670.

[2] Prisoners in ordinary criminal cases had to wait till the nineteenth century before their lot was appreciably bettered.

a noble but futile plea against such a state of things. At length, in 1693, when the Licensing Act came up for renewal, a curious quarrel in which the official licenser became involved, and which had no bearing on the merits of the question, led to the first debate in Parliament on the liberty of the Press, with the consequence that the Act was renewed only for two years and then allowed to expire. This final renunciation of the censorship of the Press was based, not on any broad grounds of principle, but was due to petty abuses connected with the administration of the Act. The new era of the modern newspaper began. Hitherto, the only newspaper had been the *London Gazette*[1] which contained nothing but such official news as the Secretary of State was pleased to allow to be published. Now appeared the *English Courant*, followed by others in quick succession. With the removal of the censorship, the temper of the pamphlets and papers improved perceptibly; for, up to this time, only the violent and reckless had dared to defy the law. Even yet, the Press was far from being absolutely free. The law of libel was strictly enforced, and, from the time of Anne until the nineteenth century, heavy stamp duties operated to keep down the number of cheap newspapers.

William Turns toward the Whigs (1693). — The Press came to be the chief organ for informing and expressing public opinion — an essential factor in party government. It was in this period that Ministers were, for the first time, chosen because they represented the party dominant in the House of Commons. As early as 1690 William had been advised to govern exclusively through Whig Ministers, for the reason that the Tories were chiefly Jacobites. William, however, disliked to bind himself absolutely to the Whigs. While the Tories, as a party, were inclined to the exiled James, they were supporters of prerogative and their leaders were experienced in administration. The Whigs, on the other hand, had been so long out of office that few of their number were well versed in public affairs, and they were opposed to giving the King a free hand either at home or abroad. But, gradually, William's own political sagacity and the arguments of Sunderland, who had wormed himself into his confidence, had convinced him that the success of his contest against Louis could best be secured by confiding himself to Ministers who commanded the support of the Whig party which controlled the Commons, was financing the war, and whose commercial prosperity, property, and religious and political security depended upon its favorable issue. Its leaders at that time consisted of a group of four men of remarkable ability and influence known as the "Junto."

[1] Started in 1665 as the *Oxford Gazette*.

The "Junto" and the First Party Cabinet (1694–1697). — Two call for special mention. John Somers was a sagacious, many-sided man, reputed to be the most eminent jurist and statesman of his time.[1] Montagu was already recognized for his financial ability and skill in debate. The Tories, disunited and disorganized, had no effective leaders to pit against this combination, for their ablest men had lost their influence. Yet, William, who disliked certain of the Whig group, and who valued the services of several of his Tory Ministers, only slowly and of necessity supplanted them by Whigs in the Cabinet. The process occupied four years, from 1693 to 1697, and, even then, he continued to consult such unofficial advisers as Sunderland and a Dutch favorite, the Earl of Portland.

The Reduction of the Standing Army (1697–1698). — No sooner was the war over than Parliament came into violent conflict with the King by insisting on a reduction of the standing army. The step was due partly to economy, for the public debt had increased to £17,000,000, and partly to a prevalent view that a standing army was not only contrary to the Constitution but dangerous to liberty. People remembered the power that Cromwell had been able to wield with the New Model at his back and the strife which his generals had caused after his death; they remembered, too, how James had tried to overawe London with his force on Hounslow Heath. There were angry debates in Parliament and a hot pamphlet controversy as well. In spite of all, the army was reduced from 87,000 to 7000,[2] though a liberal grant was made for the maintenance of the navy. The King, who was firmly convinced that such a wholesale reduction of the army was the surest way to precipitate a new war, was so disgusted that he again talked of quitting the country.

The Break-up of the Whig Ministry (1699). — The defeat of the King in his attempt to prevent the reduction of the army and the resumption by the State of Irish lands of adherents of James — a struggle in which the King's sharp practice and eagerness to reward favorites was only equaled by the partisan bitterness of the two Houses — are only the chief indications of the failure of his Ministry to control Parliament after the general election of 1698. The Tories did not get an actual majority until the Parliament of 1701; but, reënforced by the malcontent Whigs, they were able to obstruct the Junto at

[1] Recently, however, some historians have come to think that, owing to the influence of Macaulay, the attainments and integrity of Somers have been overrated.

[2] It was further provided that it should consist of Englishmen alone, thus necessitating the exclusion of the Dutch guards.

every turn. One by one, they left the Government — Montagu[1] resigned in 1699, while Somers was deprived of the Great Seal in 1700. In the later, more developed stage of the party system they would have retired in a body, directly a hostile majority was formed against them, or have appealed to the country in a general election. However, the fact that William dismissed Somers in consequence of a parliamentary attack marked another stage in the progress of party government.

The Act of Settlement (1701). — One measure of great significance stands out in the midst of the strife and confusion of these years — the Act of Settlement, which formed a necessary supplement to the Bill of Rights. It was occasioned by the death, in July, 1701, of Anne's last surviving child. In providing for the succession, the Bill of Rights went no further than the descendants of Anne. The new Act, excluding all other claimants, provided that, in the event of the death of Anne without heirs, the crown should pass to Sophia, Electress of Hanover, and her descendants. She was the granddaughter of James I and the nearest Protestant representative of the English royal house.[2] Various limitations were also embodied in the Act, some to take effect only when the new line came to the throne. Six are especially important: (1) Whoever shall come to the throne of England shall join in communion with the Church of England. (2) In case such Sovereigns shall not be natives of England they shall not engage the nation in war in defense of territories not belonging to the crown of England except by consent of Parliament. (3) Such Sovereigns shall not go out of the realm without parliamentary consent. (4) No person having an office of place or profit under the King, or who receives a pension from him, shall sit in the House of Commons. (5) Judges shall hold office during good behavior and shall be removed only upon an address of both Houses. (6) No pardon may be pleaded in bar of an impeachment.

While the first three of these provisions were designed as safeguards in the event of a foreign Sovereign coming to the throne, the last three deal with distinctly domestic problems. The provision relating to office-holders not sitting in Parliament was modified by an

[1] He retained, however, the Auditorship of the Exchequer.

[2] She was a daughter of Elizabeth and Palsgrave Frederick (see above, p. 295), and had married the Elector of Hanover. Two branches of the House of Stuart were nearer in the line of descent, but were both excluded because of their Roman Catholic faith. The elder line, descended from James II, became extinct with the death of his grandson Henry, Cardinal of York, in 1807. The younger was descended from the sister of James II who married the Duke of Orleans; it is at present represented by Mary, wife of the former King of Bavaria.

Act of 1705 which remains in force to-day.[1] The fifth provision merely remedied the evil of appointing judges during the royal pleasure, a power which the first two Stuarts had so grossly abused. The last was a legal confirmation of the attitude taken by Parliament in the impeachment of Danby in 1678.

The War of the Spanish Succession. The Claimants to the Spanish Throne. — Meantime, England had been drifting into another great Continental war occasioned by a scramble for the Spanish inheritance. Louis XIV and the Emperor Leopold I were impatiently waiting the death of the shadow King Charles II to grab his dominions, the one for the House of Bourbon, the other for the House of Hapsburg. Both had a claim on the inheritance, while still a third claim was advanced in behalf of Joseph Ferdinand, the infant son of the Elector of Bavaria.[2] Since in the interest of the European balance of power, neither England nor Holland would consent to a union of Spain either with France or the Empire, Louis urged the Bourbon claim in behalf of his second grandson, Philip of Anjou, while Leopold put in his for his second son, Charles.

[1] The Place Act of 1705 provided that holders of offices created after that date should be ineligible to sit in the House of Commons, while a member of the Lower House appointed to an office which existed earlier must resign his seat and submit himself for reëlection. This, however, does not prevent Parliament, in the Act creating a new office, from providing that the incumbent may sit in the House of Commons.

[2] Philip III

Louis XIII m. Anna Maria — Philip IV — Maria Anna m. Ferdinand III

Louis XIV m. Maria Theresa — Charles II — Margaret m. Leopold I m. Eleanor of Newburg 3d wife

Louis — Max Emanuel of Bavaria — m. Maria Antonia

Joseph Charles

Louis Philip — Joseph Ferdinand

Both Louis XIII and Louis XIV had married elder daughters of Philip III and Philip IV respectively; but both Infantas had renounced on their marriage any claim to inherit the throne of Spain. Louis XIV, however, denied the validity of these renunciations. Philip IV by will had left the crown, on the event of the death of Charles without issue, to the heirs of Margaret. Her daughter Maria Antonia, however, had renounced her claim in favor of any son that her father might have from a subsequent marriage; but this step was not recognized as legal by the Spanish.

The First and Second Partition Treaties (1698 and 1700). — The pride of the Spanish demanded that the Monarchy should be handed on intact; though a partition between the claimants seemed the only solution of the vexed question. The French King played a double game. While his ambassador was laboring at the Spanish court to secure the whole of the Spanish inheritance if possible, he and William negotiated the First Partition Treaty,[1] signed October, 1698, whereby the Spanish possessions were divided between the Electoral Prince of Bavaria, the Bourbons, and the Hapsburgs. The Spanish were furious when the news leaked out, and Charles II, 14 November, 1698, proceeded to confirm the will of Philip IV, leaving the whole dominion to Joseph Ferdinand. This arrangement, however, was upset by the sudden death of the Electoral Prince, 5 February, 1699, whereupon, a second Partition Treaty was framed between England and France which was finally signed in February, 1700. The Emperor, not satisfied with the share allotted to him, hung off. King Charles, when the news was communicated to him, "flew into an extraordinary passion," and French diplomacy, supported by the Church, now worked so effectively upon him and his advisers that he signed a final will, 3 October, 1700, less than a month before his death, leaving all his dominions to Philip of Anjou on condition that they should never be united to France. Louis forthwith threw over the Second Partition Treaty.

The Tories Forced to Join the War Party. — War was now inevitable; but it seemed at first doubtful whether William could carry England with him; for the Tories, whose policy was peace with France, were in a majority in the new Parliament which opened in February, 1701. However, the realization that Spain was to be used as a pawn in Louis' great game of establishing the political and commercial ascendancy of France aroused such a storm of anti-French wrath throughout England that even the Tory House of Commons was forced to join in the cry for war. The Spanish ambassador at Paris first aroused disquiet by declaring: *Il n'y a plus de Pyrenées.*[2] Then Louis showed his hand: in December of 1700 he declared that his grandson Philip of Anjou by mounting the throne of Spain did not renounce his place in the line of succession to the crown of France; in February, 1701,

[1] John Arbuthnot wrote a witty satire, entitled *The History of John Bull*, in which he represented England and Holland as a clothier and a linen draper undertaking to settle the estate of a bedridden old gentleman. The name now applied to the typical Englishman may be traced to this work.

[2] Literally "There are no more Pyrenees," meaning that henceforth France and Spain were one.

his troops took possession of the Barrier Fortresses in the Spanish Netherlands, and, what touched the great mercantile class in England even more closely, he issued a proclamation that France would be treated as the most favored nation in the Spanish-American trade. A stream of pamphlets appeared, unfolding vehemently the dangers which threatened the country and her commerce.[1] Public opinion demanded immediate action, to which the Commons soon responded by voting William a generous sum for aiding his allies to the extent of waging war if necessary.

The Grand Alliance (7 September, 1701). — In July, negotiations were opened, with the result that the treaty, known as the Grand Alliance, was signed 7 September, 1701. By it the Spanish possessions in the Netherlands and Italy were to be secured for the House of Austria, while England and Holland were to have any conquests which they might make in the western world. The general purposes of the war were to check the growth of France, to protect the Netherlands by an adequate barrier, and to secure English and Dutch trade.

The Death of James II (6 September, 1701). — Although William had not heard of it when he signed the treaty of the Grand Alliance, another event had occurred which accentuated the growing hostility to France. James II died 6 September, and Louis, visiting him on his death bed, promised solemnly to recognize his son as James III, King of England. In a splendid speech, the last he ever made to Parliament, William emphasized the danger which this recognition involved to the Protestant religion and to the "present and future tranquility and happiness of the country." The Houses, in reply, voted an army of 40,000 soldiers, together with an equal force for the fleet, and, early in 1702, passed an Abjuration Bill, which made it treasonable to have any dealings with the son of James, and imposed a new oath, acknowledging William as the rightful heir and lawful King and abjuring the Pretender.

Death of William (8 March, 1702). — William did not live to open the spring campaign: following his death, 8 March, the great work which he had begun was taken up and carried to a splendid fulfillment by Marlborough who had once sought to betray him. Although the late King had come to England as a deliverer, he had never been popular with the mass of his subjects. His faults of temper, his dislike of the country and the people, go far to account for this. But the explanation lies even deeper. In order to concentrate his resources for his supreme task — that of frustrating the designs of France — he

[1] England did much legitimate business with the Spanish possessions in the way of carrying on trade and exchange of wares, and still more smuggling.

labored to maintain a strong executive at a time when the tendency was toward increased Parliamentary control. Many of the chief constitutional reforms of the reign not only did not originate with him but were only accepted by him as inevitable concessions. He directed his own foreign policy without consulting his Ministers any more than he was absolutely obliged to; he was opposed to the Whigs and to Parliamentary inquiry, and he struggled throughout his reign for a standing army and an independent revenue, commonly regarded as the instruments of despotism. Yet his merits and achievements were great. Men who did not love him respected his courage and his steadfastness. He forced an Act of Grace on the angry and revengeful Whigs, he was largely responsible for the Toleration Act, and he was the first to put into operation the system of party government. Finally, his wars with France prepared the way for Great Britain's commercial and colonial supremacy.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

Narrative. Lodge; Macaulay; and Ranke.

Special. C. F. Dunbar, *Theory and History of Banking* (2 ed., 1901), ch. XI, an excellent brief account of the Bank of England. A. Andréades, *History of the Bank of England* (tr. C. Meredith, 1909).

Selections from the sources. Adams and Stephens, 241–243. Robertson, *Select Statutes*, pt. I, nos. XVIII–XX.

For further references, see Chapter XXXVI above.

CHAPTER XXXVIII

THE END OF THE STUART DYNASTY. ANNE (1702–1714)

The Character of Anne. — Anne was thirty-seven years old when she succeeded William, 8 March, 1702. Naturally meek and sluggish and of a limited understanding, she was incapable of dealing independently with the great problems at home and abroad which confronted her. She had warm affections and strong prejudices, she allowed her friends to mold her as wax, and, like her father, obstinately regarded those who disagreed with her as unworthy of all confidence. She could hardly have been more unfortunate in her closest associates. Sarah Jennings, wife of John Churchill, Earl of Marlborough, with whom as a girl she had contracted the most intimate of friendships, gained a complete ascendancy over her which lasted well into the new reign. Waiving the formalities of royalty, the favorite, under the name of Mrs. Freeman, addressed her nominal mistress as Mrs. Morley. Utterly without scruple, her interests were thoroughly bound up with those of her husband, though she often quarreled with him, as she did with every one who came within range of her shrewish tongue. Yet, while she embittered all Anne's family relationships and fomented party strife, her efforts to advance her family contributed greatly to the triumph which England achieved in the war about to open.

Her Relation to Parties and to her People. — Anne abhorred faction; but she was passionately devoted to the Church and she hated the Whigs, whom she regarded as hostile alike to the Establishment and to the prerogative. This led her to meddle busily in the administration of public affairs, whereby she came into sharp conflict with the growing tendency toward party government. All in all, however, she was personally popular. More important still, she represented the cause of Protestantism against the Pretender; moreover, she supported the Continental war until the zeal of her subjects was spent, until they began to grumble over the expense and to ask themselves what they were getting in return for all they had done for the Allies.

The Parties. Their Composition and Aims. The Tories. — In spite of Anne's prejudices, worked upon by "court intrigues and faction," the two great parties came to exercise a steadily increasing influence. The Tories, composed largely of the most conservative element in the realm — the squirearchy and the country parsons — set themselves obstinately against the changes which followed in the wake of the Revolution. They were opposed bitterly to toleration for Dissenters as a serious menace to true religion; to the National Debt and the Bank, which tended to enhance the power of the moneyed classes over the landed; and to a standing army employed against the Monarch who sheltered their true King. The great Whig lords were abominable in their eyes, since many of them were new men, not a few sprung from trading and Dissenting stock, and most of them allied with that class. The Whig bishops and Low Churchmen they classed as freethinkers or Presbyterians, hating them in consequence. Although the majority were stanch supporters of the existing Sovereign against the Pretender, they were seriously handicapped from the fact that, in principle, they still adhered to their anti-Revolutionary doctrines, a fact which caused their loyalty to Anne and the Hanoverian succession to be seriously doubted.

The Whigs. — The Whigs, made up of the great lords, the bulk of bishops and town clergy, the Nonconformists, the army men, the merchants, the financiers, and the small freeholders, were, in general — although their practice did not always accord with their principles — the party of progress, of popular as distinct from class interests, favoring the growth of commerce and toleration and the limitation of the prerogative. Also, it was they who advocated a vigorous prosecution of the war against France.

The Resources of France and the Allies at the Opening of the War. — On 4 May, 1702, the Allies at London, the Hague, and Vienna all declared war on France, while the Imperial General had already begun fighting in Italy during the previous year. In many respects Louis XIV seemed to have even greater advantages than in the previous struggle. Not only was he fighting on inside lines, but his flanks were guarded by Spain on the south and by the fortresses in the Netherlands on the north, while his alliance with the Elector of Bavaria thrust a wedge between the Dutch and the Austrians. He had an army of 400,000 men well disciplined and full of confidence, a fair-sized fleet and a considerable revenue. On the other hand, the tremendous strain due to the expenses of his magnificent Court and his constant wars had begun to tell. His debts were so enormous that he could only borrow money at 15 to 20 per cent, and it took half his annual

revenue to pay the interest. Of the Allies, Holland had a small army but a strong fleet and extensive public credit, while the Emperor, who could furnish large contingents, had no money to pay them. The burden of the war fell more and more on the English. When it opened their fleet already greatly outnumbered the French, and while their standing army consisted of only 7,000 troops in England and 12,000 in Ireland, adequate forces were soon equipped and sent into the field. More than a third of their total debt was funded, money could be borrowed at 6 per cent, and, though the annual revenue was far from adequate, it was speedily swelled by extraordinary supplies. On the other hand, though the Tories at first supported the war, party strife soon became acute, while the Allies, who had nothing in common but the desire to crush France, were torn by conflicting interests.

General Features of the War. — There were four main theaters of war: the Dutch border; the valley of the Danube, which commanded the road to Vienna; the Po valley, the key to southern France; and Spain, where Philip V had been set up as King. In the course of the struggle the Allies succeeded in driving the French out of Germany (1704); out of Italy (1706); and out of the Netherlands (1706–1708); indeed they were baffled nowhere except in Spain. This was due to their two remarkable leaders, Marlborough and the commander of the Imperial forces, Prince Eugene; to the invaluable lessons which the Allied troops had learned from their defeats under William; and to the diminished French resources, resulting from Louis' dazzling but costly conquests.

Marlborough. — In spite of Marlborough's attempted treason, William, recognizing his remarkable military and diplomatic ability, had employed him in the negotiations leading up to the Grand Alliance. Now, owing to the influence of his wife, he was made Captain-General of the English forces; while the Dutch made him Commander-in-Chief of their army as well. He fought nobly for England in court and camp; but he was so consumed with ambition and so sordid in his love of money that one is bound to believe that with him personal consideration counted more than love of country. But if he was a base, he was a splendid figure; his beauty, his charm of manner, his tact and patience made him irresistible. As a commander, in planning campaigns and in conducting battles and sieges, he showed a courage and energy, a boldness tempered with caution, and gained a degree of success which no English general has ever equaled. In his diplomacy, brilliant as it was, he made the ultimate mistake of pressing Louis too far, possibly because he wanted to continue the war for his

own glory, possibly because he honestly felt that there could be no safety for Europe until his opponent was absolutely crushed.

His Relation to Parties. — He started as a moderate Tory, but as that party cooled in its warlike zeal and lost control of the Commons,[1] he threw himself on the support of the Whigs. This brought him into conflict with Anne; and the violence of Mrs. Freeman, who became a furious Whig partisan, only widened the breach. It was a period of transition from Ministers who were individually servants of the Crown to the system under which they became a united body, collectively responsible to Parliament. Marlborough originally wanted to carry on the Government with the aid of the moderate men of both parties; later, when his Whig supporters were forced out, he sought to hold on regardless of that fact. Thus he made the mistake of going too far against the old system without going far enough in the direction of the new. It was only his great victories and the division among his opponents that enabled him to remain in control as long as he did.

The Campaigns of 1702 and 1703. — When he took command in the Netherlands in 1702, he was so hampered by the Dutch field deputies that he was unable to bring on a pitched battle during this or the following year. His efforts, however, during the years 1702 and 1703 were not wasted, for he succeeded in forcing the French back along the roads in the Spanish Netherlands and the Rhine country by which they might strike at the Dutch from the southeast and east. In the following year, as a result of a successful English raid on Vigo Bay, Portugal joined the Grand Alliance, thus furnishing a basis of operations against Spain. In the campaign of 1703 the interest centered in an attempt of the French, in conjunction with Bavarians, to make a dash on Vienna. Although it miscarried, owing to the supineness of the Elector, the danger remained critical, for the French generals gained decided successes in western Germany, while the Emperor had to face a disquieting rising of the Hungarian Protestants. During the winter, the Elector aroused himself sufficiently to capture Passau on the Danube. The Empire seemed lost to the Allies unless a decisive blow could be struck.

Marlborough's Campaign of 1704. — In the face of the crisis, Marlborough framed and executed a daring plan which marked the turning point in the war. This was to march down to the Danube and relieve the Imperial capital by defeating the combined French and Bavarian armies. Realizing that the Dutch would never consent to leave their frontier thus exposed and that Louis would forestall him if the secret

[1] Of the five Parliaments elected during the reign three were Tory: 1702–5; 1710–13; 1713–14; and two were Whig: 1705–8; 1708–10.

leaked out, he took no one into his confidence, except the Queen and the Lord Treasurer,[1] and gave out to the Grand Pensionary that he was going to operate along the Moselle. Leaving a portion of his forces to guard the Netherlands, he marched rapidly up the Rhine, followed by the incompetent French commander Villeroy, who was completely in the dark as to his movements. Passing the Moselle he struck southeast into Würtemberg, where late in June he held a conference with Prince Eugene, whom he left to hold the Rhine against Villeroy, who was halting uncertainly on the left bank, and joined forces with the Margrave of Baden. Thence he proceeded to cross the Danube at Donauwörth, while the Elector, after a vain attempt to dispute his passage, retreated to Augsburg, where he was later joined by a large French contingent under Tallard. Marlborough was now between the enemy and Vienna with Bavaria at his mercy. He at once began to ravage and burn, though, as he wrote his wife, it was so contrary to his disposition that nothing but absolute necessity could bring him to consent to it.

The Battle of Blenheim (13 August, 1704). — However, in danger of being cut off from his communications and his bases of supply, he soon saw that the time had come to risk a battle. So he quietly recrossed to the northern bank of the Danube, effecting a junction with Prince Eugene, who had dropped back from the Rhine. Meantime, the Elector and Tallard, thinking that they had only Eugene to deal with, left their strong position and crossed the river in their turn with the design of destroying the magazines of the Allies. Near the village of Blenheim [2] on the north bank of the Danube, they were attacked by Marlborough and Eugene, 13 August, Tallard's forces were cut off and surrounded by Marlborough, and Tallard himself was taken prisoner, though the Elector, who faced Eugene, managed to escape with a considerable portion of his forces. The Allies, at a cost of 12,000 men, destroyed 14,000 of the enemy and took 11,000 prisoners. It was, as Marlborough wrote his wife in the gathering darkness, "a glorious victory." The spell which had so long seemed to render the French arms irresistible had at last been broken. As a more immediate result the Empire had been saved. Though Marlborough was not in condition to run down and crush the fugitives, Villeroy, who came to their aid, was obliged to recross the Rhine, and, before the close of November, the Elector had agreed to a treaty by which Bavaria was made subject to Imperial authority.

[1] It is possible, however, that he took Prince Eugene into his confidence as early as the winter of 1703–4.

[2] Hochstädt, after which the French name the battle, lies farther to the west.

The Capture of Gibraltar (1704). — Meantime, Sir George Rooke, headed for England after an unsuccessful cruise in the Mediterranean, fell in with Sir Cloudesley Shovel. Finding the commanding fortress of Gibraltar was almost undefended — as a matter of fact it had a garrison of only eighty men — they sent a force ashore to whom the Governor surrendered, 4 August. As a result of the capture of Gibraltar, effected with so little effort, England controls the entrance of the Mediterranean to-day.

The Reception of the News in England. — The news of Blenheim was of course received in England with transports of joy. It was the first great victory on land which the English had won against the French in three hundred years. The days of Crécy, Poitiers, and Agincourt were, it seemed, to be repeated, and Louis XIV, who had so long lorded it over Europe, was to be brought to his knees. Marlborough's return was hailed with fervent demonstrations, and he received a grant of Crown land on which a castle was erected which is still known as Blenheim.[1] The Duke's head, however, was far from being turned, for he knew that the Tories were murmuring at the cost of the war and seeking to disparage his triumph. Yet, in spite of sharp party differences, Parliament made generous grants.

The Allies gain a Foothold in Spain (1705). — It seemed as if France could not stand the financial strain much longer: her commerce was all but destroyed; her manufactures were languishing for want of markets; the country apparently could bear no more taxation; and the bankers would lend no more money. Yet, by heroic exertions and by various shifts, strong armies were sent into the field for the campaign of 1705, so that Marlborough, who, notwithstanding his brilliant success of the previous year, was still held in by timid Field Deputies, could do nothing but mark time. In Spain, on the other hand, the Allies, late in the year, managed to capture Barcelona, 14 September. This was followed by the submission of the whole province of Catalonia and parts of the adjoining Aragon. The Austrian Archduke, who accompanied the expedition, was formally proclaimed King of Spain as Charles III. Meantime, his feeble and ineffective father, Leopold, was succeeded by Charles's older brother, the energetic Joseph, who at once set about to reform the administration and, with the aid of Marlborough, to plan a vigorous campaign for 1706.

The Whigs in Power and the Campaign of 1706. — The summer elections of 1705 had gone in favor of the Whigs, largely owing to the growing enthusiasm for the war, which the Tories were ceasing to sup-

[1] At the end of the campaign of 1702 he had been made a Duke and given a pension of £5000 a year for life.

port with the ardor that they had shown at the beginning of the reign. The Queen, who obstinately regarded a Whig "as a Republican and an atheist," opposed every one that was introduced into the Ministry; but owing to the domineering Duchess Sarah and the war fever, she gave way in each case, until at the end of three years, not a single Tory was left, though at the price of a series of quarrels which in the end left the Queen hopelessly estranged from her old favorite. A victory was essential to Louis, and the vain and foolish Villeroy started for the Netherlands, bent on obeying his Sovereign's injunction to return "covered with glory." In consequence, he left a strong position whence it might have taken a whole campaign to dislodge him; whereupon, Marlborough unexpectedly swooped down on him, and engaged him in battle at Ramillies, twenty-nine miles southeast of Brussels, 23 May. Villeroy, though he fought bravely, was outgeneraled and his forces driven from the field hotly pursued by the Allies. Many of the leading towns of Brabant and Flanders surrendered one after another. The victors, shortly after Ramillies, issued a proclamation promising to all who submitted to Charles III protection of their religion and property, as well as all the privileges they had enjoyed under the late Charles II. Aside from the danger involved in holding out, the thrifty burghers welcomed the terms; for the sovereignty of Philip really subjected them to the despotism of Louis XIV, while the Emperor, who had stood behind his younger brother Charles III, was poor and far away. Louis XIV immediately called Vendôme from Italy to restore some spirit to the beaten army.

The French Driven out of Northern Italy (1706). — Eugene, reënforced by an army of Germans and provided with English subsidies, was able to profit by the transfer of his efficient opponent to the Netherlands. Effecting a junction with the Duke of Savoy, who had joined the Grand Alliance in 1703, the two marched on Turin and, 7 September, defeated the French army which was besieging the city. As a result, Louis XIV soon withdrew his troops from northern Italy.

The Question of the Union between England and Scotland. — While the war naturally absorbed most of the public energy, a few steps of constitutional importance were taken during the early years of Anne; but the one really "great act of domestic statesmanship" of the reign was the union of England and Scotland, brought to completion in the session of 1706–1707. The personal union, beginning in 1603, had weathered the great Civil War and the Revolution of 1688, but, as the century drew to a close, the Scots began to realize more and more acutely the unsatisfactory character of the existing arrangement. Two possibilities were open: complete separation or closer union.

To the former course, ardently desired by the Presbyterians and the patriots, England would never consent, particularly in view of Scotland's ancient attachment to France. On the other hand, there was a large and steadily increasing class with whom considerations of trade outweighed those of religious and political independence. They naturally wanted to draw closer to England [1] in order to share in her markets.

The Darien Project (1695–1699). — The commercial spirit manifested itself in a daring attempt to break into the Spanish monopoly in the New World. It was a product of the fruitful brain of William Paterson, who induced the Scotch Parliament to pass an Act, June 1695, founding a "Company of Scotland for Trading to Africa and the Indies." As a means of commanding the trade routes of the eastern and western world, the "Darien Company," as it was popularly called, designed to establish a colony on the Isthmus of Panama, a spot which Paterson had once visited, whether as a pirate or a missionary is uncertain. The capital stock, fixed at £400,000 and issued in £100 shares, was quickly subscribed, and more than half the amount was actually paid in, though the price of a single share represented a fortune to the poor and thrifty Scot of those days. The opposition in London was intense, partly from trade rivalry and partly from the fear of complications with Spain, who claimed the territory in which Darien was situated. Nevertheless, 25 July, 1698, the first group of colonists was sent to the Isthmus. The cargo which they took, consisting of felt slippers, periwigs, heavy woolens, and English Bibles, could not have been more useless for trading in a tropical country with illiterate natives who wore the scantiest of garments. The climate proved unbearable; those who survived at length gave up and sailed away. A second group who, in the meantime, had been enticed to sail for Darien by lying reports of the indefatigable leaders, was finally driven out by the Spanish. Paterson's brilliant Darien scheme had succumbed to a deadly climate and Spanish monopoly; but it had the result of finally convincing the commercial party in Scotland that nothing could be accomplished without the backing of England, which could only be secured by a closer union.

The Union Finally Brought About (1706–1707). — Anne, in the very first year of her reign, appointed Commissioners to treat with Commissioners from Scotland; but the elements of obstruction were so strong that the English Parliament had to adjudge Scots to be aliens and to forbid all Scotch exports into England, before the

[1] The Scotch Episcopalians, for obvious reasons, allied themselves with this party.

Scots finally appointed Commissioners in a mood to negotiate. The two bodies met in April, 1706, and before the close of the summer had arranged a treaty. The Scotch Estates, when they met in October, had to face a torrent of popular opposition: the mob outside hooted and hustled those known to favor the measure, riots broke out both in Edinburgh and Glasgow and petitions poured in from all over the country. Notwithstanding continued resistance, the treaty was ratified, 16 January, 1707. The Church was won over by an Act guaranteeing the existing Presbyterian Establishment; greater commercial advantages appealed to many, the prospect of better government to others, while the battle of Ramillies, which seemed to point to the certain downfall of the French, no doubt influenced the result.

The Terms of the Union. — The speedy and favorable outcome created general surprise in England where bets had been freely laid that the treaty would be rejected. When the articles were taken up in the English Parliament, in February, 1707, the chief opposition came from the High Church Tories who feared for the safety of the Establishment if any considerable number of Presbyterians were admitted to a share in the Government, an objection which was met by an Act securing the Church of England. The Act of Union provided that the two Kingdoms were to be united under the name of Great Britain and represented by one Parliament. There was to be complete freedom of trade between the two countries at home and abroad. Scottish laws and legal procedure were to be preserved. Forty-five Scotch members were to sit in the House of Commons, while for every session the Scotch peers were to elect sixteen of their number to represent them in the House of Lords.

Its Ultimate Results. — Anne in giving her consent, 6 March, 1707, expressed the wish that henceforth her subjects of both Kingdoms would have "hearts disposed to become one people"; but it was long before the hope was fulfilled. The mass of Scots, traditionally hostile to their richer southern neighbors, clung to the belief that they had been betrayed by a knot of corrupt politicians. The eighteenth century had run more than half its course before the "prosperity of the country convinced them that the Union had been a necessity and a blessing." Each nation, as it proved, needed the other.

The Reverses of the Allies (1707). — The victories of 1706 were followed by a year of reverses. In the Netherlands Vendôme conducted an able defensive campaign, while Marlborough was much hampered by the Dutch, who, feeling that France was sufficiently reduced and that to prolong the war further would only increase the

greatness of England, refused to allow him to force a decisive engagement. Another French army crossed the Rhine and carried the war into the Empire. In Spain an Anglo-Portuguese force, in an effort to recover Madrid which had been captured and lost, was overwhelmingly defeated 25 April, 1707, at Almanza, where they lost three fourths of their troops, all their artillery, and most of their baggage. This reverse, for which the so-called King Charles was largely to blame, cost all the gains painfully made during the two previous years. Finally, mainly because the Emperor Joseph detached considerable contingents to fight in southern Italy, Prince Eugene failed in an attempt to invade Provence.

The Campaign of 1708 in the Netherlands. Oudenarde (11 July). — Vendôme opened the campaign of 1708 in the Netherlands by recovering Ghent and Bruges, where the citizens, alienated by the domineering of the Dutch, readily admitted him. Marlborough saw that it was necessary to force a battle. By a rapid march he came upon the enemy near Oudenarde on the road between the newly recovered cities and the frontier. He won a brilliant victory, 11 July, darkness alone saving the enemy from capture. Lille, a great fortress which guarded the French frontier, was thereupon besieged and taken, 22 October, Ghent was recaptured, 2 January, 1709, and the French were forced to evacuate all western Flanders, including Bruges.

The Negotiations of 1709. — In 1709 Louis was reduced to the point of consenting that the House of Bourbon should resign the Spanish inheritance. When, however, the Allies — whose policy was dictated by the English Whig leaders — insisted that, in case of Philip's refusal, he should assist in driving his own grandson out of the country he withdrew his ambassador and issued an appeal to his people. Exhausted as they were they responded loyally.

Successes of the Allies in the Netherlands, and Reverses in Spain (1709–10). — Villars, in command of the Army of the Netherlands, which the French had put into the field only with the most heroic sacrifices, profited by the delay which the peace negotiations afforded, to strengthen his lines. On 11 September, the Allies attacked him in a very strong position at Malplaquet. While Marlborough and Eugene cut the French forces in two and drove them from the field, they retired in good order with loss far less than that of the victors. In Spain the Allies never recovered the ground lost in 1707. Their only success in the next three years was the capture of the island of Minorca, September, 1708. There Port Mahon was fitted up with supplies and a dockyard, and furnished an admirable naval base for the English fleet in the Mediterranean. On 23 September, 1710, the Allies

succeeded once more in taking Madrid; but Vendôme, who was sent to command in the peninsula, cut off their supplies from Portugal and forced them to hurry back to their base in Catalonia. One division of the retreating army was defeated, 8 December, while another, though it fought a drawn battle, was obliged to retire from the field. Thus the victories of Oudenarde and Malplaquet were neutralized as Ramillies had been by Almanza. In Spain alone, where a decisive victory would have put an end to the war, the Allies were unable to prevail.

Growing Reaction against the Whigs and the War. — Louis reopened peace negotiations with the Dutch in the autumn of 1709; but nothing was accomplished till the overthrow of the Whig party nearly a year later. Their party had won again in the autumn elections of 1708; but its power steadily declined. Anne had taken to herself a new favorite in Abigail Masham, one of her bedchamber women. The gravity of the situation lay in the fact that Harley, leader of the Tory Opposition, was related to Mrs. Masham and through her kept in constant communication with his Sovereign. Marlborough, in his eagerness to put himself above the danger of party strife, made the mistake of asking that the office of Captain-General be conferred upon him for life, a step which gave his enemies a chance to compare him with Cromwell and to accuse him of aiming at military dictatorship. The people were growing more and more restive under the increasing burden of taxation, and the public discontent was fed and voiced by the press and virulent party pamphlets. Some of the most famous names in English literature engaged in the controversy, but the man who produced a fury of reaction which swept the Whigs from power was an obscure parson.

Dr. Sacheverell's Sermon (5 November, 1709). — Dr. Henry Sacheverell, who had already achieved some reputation by the fervor of his oratory and by the vigor of his personal attacks on those in high places who favored Dissent and were supposed to be cold toward the Establishment, preached a violent sermon, 5 November, at St. Paul's before the mayor and aldermen on the "Perils of Paul among false brethren." He lashed the administration, railed at toleration, and exhorted his hearers to rise in defense of the Church. Coming as it did in the midst of intense party excitement, it roused a panic of religious bigotry against the Dissenters and the Whigs who protected them. Consequently, in December, the Ministry resolved to impeach Sacheverell for high crimes and misdemeanors. Four charges were framed. First, that he had denied the lawfulness of resistance. Secondly, that he had declaimed against the toleration granted to

Dissenters. Thirdly, that he had declared that the Church was in danger. Fourthly, that, for seditious purposes, he had asserted that her Majesty's administration in civil and ecclesiastical affairs tended to the destruction of the Constitution.

His Trial (1710). — His trial, which opened in February, 1710, was attended with the wildest excitement. It was hotly discussed in the coffee houses, in the streets, indeed in every sort of assembly. The Doctor was cheered and praised as a martyr and saint, while Anne, whenever she passed by on her way to the sittings in Westminster Hall, was greeted with cries of "God bless your Majesty and the Church!" "We hope your Majesty is for Dr. Sacheverell!" The more violent, whose destructiveness far exceeded their piety, attacked the Dissenting meetinghouses and in general created such an uproar that the troops had to be called out to restore order. After three weeks of altercation the Doctor was found guilty, but was let off with a light sentence. His conviction proved to be a costly victory. Books, such as the *Pious Life and Sufferings of Dr. Sacheverell from his Birth to his Sentence*, poured from the press, together with such other manifestations of sympathy that the Lord Treasurer in a letter to Marlborough expressed the fervent wish that: "this uneasy trial had never begun."

The Queen Dismisses the Whigs and Calls in the Tories (1710). — The anti-Whig revulsion, which came to a head in the Sacheverell trial, gave the Queen a chance which she had long been seeking to get rid of the party so hateful to her. Mrs. Freeman had her last personal interview, 17 April, 1710, and a stormy one it was. The strength of the Cabinet was weakened from the fact that every man was working for himself. The chief offender was Marlborough, who made it quite clear that he would cling to office whatever happened, whereas if he had threatened to resign he might have kept his colleagues in office for some time longer. Several were dismissed during the summer of 1710, and, though Parliament was still Whig, Anne replaced the fallen Ministers by the Tories, Harley and St. John, congratulating herself that she was now released from captivity. Robert Harley united extreme caution with much talent for intrigue, but possessed few statesmanlike qualities. St. John, brilliant, erratic, audacious and dissipated, was in most respects the very opposite of his plodding, decorous and secretive colleague, though neither was overburdened with scruple. While Harley tried to steer a middle course all through his tenure of power, St. John was bent on an out-and-out Tory administration. Yet this ill-assorted couple managed to pull together long enough to bring the war to a close. In the September elections the Tories, thanks to the Sacheverell frenzy, the royal

control of patronage, the heavy war taxes, and the insufficient preparation of the Whigs, recovered a majority which they held for four years.

Peace Negotiations with France (1711). — Marlborough had taken a few fortresses in 1710, but he had not ventured on any daring move, partly from lack of support on the part of his Allies, partly because, in view of the party crisis in England, he feared that a false step would lead to his downfall. In 1711, however, in spite of all obstacles, he succeeded by a series of brilliant feints and sieges in piercing his adversary's strong lines, so that by autumn he was in a position to invade France. But this proved to be his last campaign. Harley and St. John had already opened secret negotiations between London and Paris in January, 1711. The preliminaries, which were finally agreed upon in October, had been greatly facilitated by a revulsion against the war on the part of Anne. Furthermore, the death of the Emperor Joseph, 17 April, 1711, leaving Charles as his heir, greatly strengthened the peace party; for it was futile to drive Philip from Spain in order to unite the country to the Hapsburg dominions.

The Whig Attempt to Obstruct the Peace. The Occasional Conformity Act (1711). — In return for assistance in obstructing peace in Parliament, the Whigs went so far as to assist the High Church wing of the Tories to pass an Occasional Conformity Act, 1711, which provided that any holder of an office who had qualified by taking the sacrament as required by the Test and Corporation Acts and should afterwards be convicted of attending Dissenting places of worship should be fined and forfeit his office. The Dissenters were assured that, when the Whigs returned to power, the Act would be repealed.[1] In the words of a Tory satirist: "Jack had been induced to hang himself on the promise that he would soon be cut down." Thus the Whigs sacrificed their principles on religious liberty, and a section of the Tories their convictions on the prolongation of the war. Though this ill-assorted alliance obtained a temporary majority in the Upper House, their efforts to stem the tide soon proved to be vain.

The Removal of Marlborough (31 December, 1711). — Swift entered the fray with his famous *Conduct of the Allies*, in which he argued that the English who had least to gain had come to assume practically the whole burden of the war. Prepared under the supervision of St. John and written in the most trenchant, logical style of the greatest living master of English, the work was eagerly read and had a powerful influence on public opinion. In order to prevent any further obstruction it was proposed to remove Marlborough from

[1] As a matter of fact it was repealed in 1718.

his command. He controlled a strong party among the Peers, he was high in the councils of the Allies, and he might, in another campaign, gain a victory that would raise the demands of the opponents of peace. He was charged with appropriating funds from the moneys granted to the bread contractors and with deducting a percentage from the sums appropriated for soldiers' pay. While he doubtless did do so, it is equally clear that he employed what he took in the secret service. His dismissal was accompanied by the creation of twelve new peers which gave the Tories control of the Upper House.

The Opening of the Congress of Utrecht and the End of the War. — This same month of January, 1712, a congress of the Allies opened at Utrecht to discuss terms of peace, but weeks were consumed in tedious formalities. Since no suspension of hostilities had been provided for, Eugene took the field in the spring as commander of the Allies, with the aim of turning the French lines and opening the way to Paris. The English contingents were under the Duke of Ormonde, who had orders to engage in no battle or siege without further instructions. For a time he assisted the Prince by covering his siege operations, but, 16 July, in response to instructions from home, he drew his troops off to Dunkirk, leaving the Austrians and the Dutch to continue the campaign alone. With their lines thus weakened, the Dutch were defeated in battle 24 July, while Eugene had to yield several strong places and retire beyond the Scheldt. The Tory Ministers who were responsible for what happened had only this justification, that nothing less would induce the Emperor to make peace.

The Peace of Utrecht (1713). — The peace of Utrecht was signed with France, 12 April, 1713, by Great Britain, the States General, Savoy, and Portugal. The Emperor made a separate peace with Louis XIV. By the terms concluded between England and France Louis (1) recognized the order of succession established by the Act of Settlement, and agreed that the son of the late James II should never be allowed in France. (2) He solemnly ratified a renunciation by Philip V, made 5 November, 1712, of his claims to the throne of France. (3) He promised to accept for his French subjects no advantages of trade with Spain not extended to the other Powers. (4) He ceded to Great Britain considerable portions of territory in North America, including the Hudson's Bay Settlement, Acadia,[1] and Newfoundland, retaining, however, certain fishing rights in the neighboring waters and the right to dry fish on the shores of Newfoundland.

[1] In 1708 the British had captured Port Royal (renamed Annapolis) and occupied Acadia (Nova Scotia).

England and Spain. — The treaty between England and Spain was not concluded till July; for Philip had no representatives at the Congress and no power to treat till the Powers had acknowledged him as King. (1) Gibraltar and Minorca were ceded to England. (2) By the Asiento [1] she was granted for thirty years the monopoly of importing negroes into Spanish America. (3) British merchants were accorded the right of sending one ship a year to trade in Spanish-American ports.

France and the States General. — The Spanish Netherlands were handed over to the Dutch, to be ceded to Austria so soon as an "adequate barrier" could be agreed upon. This happened in 1715, when a final Barrier Treaty was arranged by which the Dutch were allowed to garrison certain fortified places commanding the French border. By the treaty between France and the Emperor, the latter got, in addition to the Spanish Netherlands, various of the Spanish possessions in Italy.

Results of the War. — In general the Allies had gained the objects for which they had taken up arms. They could have achieved their original aims as early as 1708, but, not long after the opening of the conflict, they had undertaken the further design of driving Philip from the throne of Spain, and, puffed up by their successes, they had driven Louis to desperation, with the consequence that he had continued the fighting until he forced them to accept less than in the full tide of their triumph they had once rejected. Although Marlborough, owing to adverse circumstances, had failed to realize his ambition of crushing France utterly and dictating his own terms, his military achievements had been unparalleled, and chiefly through his efforts Great Britain had played a remarkable rôle. She had "held the Grand Alliance together; she financed the other nations; her fleet had almost a monopoly of the ocean; her soldiers, for the first time since Agincourt, decided the fate of Europe on famous fields . . . and British Ministers had dictated the terms of peace." Louis, who in eleven years had lost as many pitched battles, succeeded in retaining the throne of Spain for his grandson, and for himself, with the exception of a few border towns, practically all that he had acquired during the long years of his aggrandizement; but Great Britain, besides making substantial territorial and commercial gains, had put a stop to his oppressions and struck a heavy blow at the old régime, which, after a series of attacks more and more frequent as the century advanced, was finally swept away by the French Revolution.

[1] A Spanish word meaning "legal compact."

The Rivalry of Harley and St. John (1713–1714). — The remainder of Anne's reign was chiefly occupied with the question of the succession and with the struggles of the two leaders of the Tory party. The relations between Harley and St. John, which had become strained after the settlement of the terms of peace, finally developed into an open feud. St. John not only chafed at the wary unenterprising policy of his inscrutable colleague, but he was jealous of him as well. Harley had been made Earl of Oxford and Lord Treasurer in 1711, while St. John, created Viscount Bolingbroke, 2 June, 1712, had to be content with the next lower grade in the peerage. This he attributed to the treachery of his rival, though it was really due to the Queen, who could not overcome her distrust of a man reputed to be a freethinker and a notorious evil liver. Yet the Whigs were as yet in no position to profit by this personal rift in the Ministry. Marlborough was hopelessly discredited. Threatened with judicial proceedings, baited by abusive pamphlets, and even pursued on the street by cries of "Stop thief!" he finally retired to the Continent, whence he did not return till the close of the year. The Whigs, however, had some advantages over their opponents which told in the long run: they were grouped mostly in the populous commercial and manufacturing centers, where they could be easily organized at a crisis, and they were united on the Hanoverian succession. The Tories, on the other hand, were scattered in the country regions, and they were divided between the exiled Stuarts and the Hanoverians; for the majority were unwilling to accept the Pretender so long as he remained a Roman Catholic.

The Schism Act (1714). — The session of 1714, in which the Tory Ministry was bitterly attacked for the recent peace, as well as for not taking more effectual means to secure the Protestant succession, proved a stormy one. Bolingbroke, who had at length got the bit in his teeth, aimed a crushing blow at the Dissenters by passing the Schism Act, which provided that no person was to keep or even teach a public or private school unless he was a member of the Church of England. This measure, repealed four years later, was an attempt to cut at the very roots of the growth of the Dissenting faiths by making it impossible for them to educate their children. Bolingbroke, who had himself been educated by a Nonconformist minister, was impelled by no religious motive; his sole aim was to outbid the cautious Oxford for the favor of Queen Anne.

The Dismissal of Oxford (27 July, 1714). — He saw that the time had now come to strike, if ever he were to secure the supremacy. The Queen was failing in health, and, with a Tory majority both in

Parliament and throughout the Kingdom, it was essential to improve the opportunity while she still lived to fill every position, military and civil, with trusted followers in order to meet the Whig reaction which was bound to come with her death and the accession of the Hanoverians. He has been accused of plotting to bring in the Pretender, but while his design is far from clear, it is more probable that his aim was to secure control of the State, ally himself with the Jacobites, and, with these weapons in his hands, to make such terms with the Hanoverians as would place him at the head of the new Government. It was a bold stroke for fortune, which seemed for a moment as if it were going to succeed. On 27 July Oxford was abruptly dismissed from office. While his overthrow was due largely to the intrigues of his rival, the reasons which Anne gave to the Council have a curious interest: "He neglected all business, she could seldom understand him, and even when he was intelligible she could place no dependence on what he said. He never came punctually at times when she appointed. When he did come he was often tipsy, and behaved toward her with . . . disrespect."

The Death of Anne and the Defeat of Bolingbroke's Schemes (1 August, 1714). — Suddenly, 29 July, the Queen was stricken with her last illness and Bolingbroke's well-laid plans were thrown into confusion. Had the Queen only lived six weeks, he calculated that he could have made himself master of the situation. Already a strong faction had developed against him, and the crisis forced them to act quickly. At a meeting of the Privy Council, held on the 30th, the anti-Bolingbroke combination proved strong enough to propose, or to force Bolingbroke to propose, as successor to Harley in the Lord Treasurership, Shrewsbury, a former Whig who had been one of the seven to sign the invitation to William of Orange, but who had left England early in William's reign and lived for long years in obscurity in Italy. Since his return in 1710 he had been a trusted councilor of the Queen. Fortunately for the cause of peace and the Hanoverians, he now showed a courage and decision foreign to him since the Revolution days. At the bedside of the dying Queen he received the white staff of office with the royal command to use it for the good of the country. At once he took measures for the defense of the Kingdom and the securing of the succession. On the morning of 1 August Anne died, and that afternoon, the heralds went about London and Westminster proclaiming George as King of Great Britain. Bolingbroke's schemes, whatever they were, had come to naught, and the last of the Stuarts had ceased to reign.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

Narrative. Trevelyan; Ranke and *Cambridge Modern History*. I. S. Leadam, *Political History of England*, 1702–1760 (1909). J. F. Bright, *History of England* (1889), III, a clear and accurate summary. F. W. Wyon, *History of Great Britain during the Reign of Queen Anne* (2 vols., 1876) the fullest history of the reign, but dry and somewhat antiquated. Lord Stanhope, *The Reign of Queen Anne* (1870) a careful but less detailed account. W. E. H. Lecky, *History of England in the Eighteenth Century* (cab. ed., 7 vols., 1907), the most informing general work on the period.

Special. W. T. Morgan, *English Political Parties and Leaders during the Reign of Queen Anne* (1920), a scholarly study. W. F. Lord, "Development of Political Parties during the Reign of Queen Anne," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*. New Series, XIV, 1900. G. C. Butler, *The Tory Tradition* (Bolingbroke, Burke, Disræli, and Salisbury, 1914).

Army and Navy. W. Coxe, *Memoirs of Marlborough* (good maps in the ed. of 1818). Fortescue, *British Army;* Mahan, *Sea Power;* Corbett, *England in the Mediterranean.*

Biography. Hon. H. Elliot, *The Life of Sidney, Earl of Godolphin* (1888). T. Macknight's (1863) is still the best life of Bolingbroke, a more recent work is that of W. Sichel (1901), C. Collin's (1888) is a stimulating sketch. E. B. Roscoe, *Harley, Earl of Oxford* (1902). S. J. Reid, *John and Sarah, Duke and Duchess of Marlborough* (1914).

Contemporary. Burnet, *Own Times*. Swift, *The Conduct of the Allies* (1711). Bolingbroke, *Letters on the State of Parties at the Accession of George I.*

Scotland and Ireland. Works already cited. P. H. Brown, *The Legislative Union of England and Scotland* (1914). W. L. Matthieson, *Scotland and the Union, 1695–1747* (1905). D. DeFoe, *History of the Union between England and Scotland* (1787), a valuable contemporary account. Lecky, *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century* (3 vols., 1873–4), I.

The Church. Hutton; Wakeman; and Stoughton. Abbey and Overton, *The English Church in the Eighteenth Century* (1896), the authoritative work on the period.

CHAPTER XXXIX

THE FIRST HANOVERIAN, GEORGE I (1714–1727)

The Peaceful Reception of the Hanoverian Dynasty. — While the people were "gaping and staring" the crisis passed. Bolingbroke and the other Tory leaders remained inactive, stocks rose, and Parliament, when it met, voted a reward of £100,000 for the capture of the Pretender, who found the prospect so discouraging that he did not venture an invasion. The arrival of the new King, 18 September, provoked no opposition and awakened some enthusiasm. Already, before crossing the Channel, he dismissed Bolingbroke, and a new Whig Ministry was constituted, under the leadership of Charles, Viscount Townshend, Secretary of State for the Northern Department. Shrewsbury resigned the office of Lord Treasurer and soon relapsed into his former inactivity.

The New King. — George Lewis inherited the crown from his mother Sophia, who had died in the previous June. He was at this time fifty-four years old and had been Elector of Hanover since 1698. The early life of the future King had been an active one: he had fought for the Emperor against the Turks, he had seen active service under King William, he had joined the Grand Alliance, and for three years commanded the Imperial forces on the Upper Rhine. He had carefully refrained from meddling in English affairs; though, after the death of his mother, he apparently took a more lively interest in the succession struggle.

Personal Traits and Favorites. — Even as a young man he was frigid and silent, qualities which clung to him through life. He was heavy and awkward, narrow and obstinate. Yet in Hanover he was extremely popular; for he loved his country and his people as much as he was capable of loving anything. So he started for his new Kingdom "without elation." Two female favorites followed in his train, — the fat and unwieldy von Kielmannsegge, created Countess of Darlington, and the tall, lean von Schulenburg, created Duchess of Kendal. Both were rapacious and drove a thriving patronage. In addition, there were two German councilors, a French secretary,

and two black servants who combined to fleece the people and added to the unpopularity which the foreign King's uncouth ways, low common tastes, his unconcealed preference for his native land and ignorance of the English language and customs, was bound to create. Yet, after all, unheroic and parsimonious as he was, he was much to be preferred to his Stuart rival. He was courageous, just and prudent, painstaking, frugal in his expenses and punctual in his payments: he defended the country from invasion, kept the peace at home and abroad and formed strong alliances. He has been justly accused of guiding his foreign policy primarily in the Hanoverian interests; but they were usually to England's advantage and never to her detriment. Moreover, by his very indifference to English domestic concerns, by letting his Whig Ministers run the affairs of the country,[1] he contributed greatly to foster the growth of Cabinet and party government.

The Prospects of the New Reign. — Although the new King had been brought in without bloodshed his prospects were by no means unclouded. The energy of Shrewsbury and the Council had dumbfounded the Jacobites and the army, and the moneyed classes were strongly Hanoverian; but George's unqualified support of the Whigs, the exclusion of the Tories from all preferment, together with the bitter attacks directed against them for their actions during the last years of Queen Anne, tended to force even the more moderate into the arms of the Pretender. Scotland was seething with discontent and Ireland was only held down by crushing laws backed by military forces. Abroad, Prussia and Holland were the only Powers upon which the Hanoverians could safely count; France was still smarting from her recent humiliation, while Spain was her ally. The Emperor felt himself defrauded by the late peace and was not on good terms with George.

Popular Discontent in England. The Riot Act (1715). — No sooner was the crisis of the succession passed than popular discontent began to manifest itself. Riots broke out at various places, "foreign government" was denounced, Dissenters were insulted, their chapels were attacked, and Tory pamphlets poured from the press. Nevertheless, the Tory Parliament was succeeded by one in which the Whigs were in the majority, a majority which they retained for nearly fifty years. The elections were attended with the usual violence. In view of the recent tumults, a Riot Act was passed early in 1715, providing that if any twelve persons, assembled for the disturbance of the peace, should refuse to disperse after proclamation read by a

[1] Except at rare intervals when they came in conflict with his foreign policy.

magistrate, they might be treated as felons, and those who shot them down would not be answerable for murder.

The Rising of 1715. — Three of the Tory leaders were impeached, including Bolingbroke, who fled the country, a step which drew down an Act of Attainder on his head; after the news reached him in France, he openly espoused the Stuart cause, became Secretary of State to the Pretender James and the leading spirit in the famous movement of 1715 to restore the old line by means of a general rising, supported by an invasion from France. The success of the undertaking depended upon three conditions: England and Scotland should rise together; James should be on the spot; and he should have substantial aid from abroad. None of these conditions were fulfilled; the movement only came to a head in the north of England and in Scotland, and resulted in hopeless failure. The prompt and decisive measures of the Government prevented a rising planned in the south and west of England, fleets were set to guard the ports, and a small expedition sent from France was prevented even from landing. The next blow came with the death of Louis XIV, 1 September. Again Bolingbroke had been frustrated by a death, for Louis was an ardent champion of the exiled family, and was burning to retrieve his recent defeat. He was succeeded by his great-grandson Louis XV, a sickly child; and the Duke of Orleans, who became Regent, gave no countenance to the Jacobite leaders. With no prospect of a rising in southern England or of support from France, Bolingbroke sent messages to prevent the Scots from taking up arms, but it was too late.

The Earl of Mar Summons the Clans. — North of the Border the opposition to the existing Government was too bitter and widespread to be satisfied with scheming, grumbling, drinking toasts to the "King over the water," and with occasional riots. The Highlanders still nursed their hatred against the Campbells, the Episcopalians and the Roman Catholics chafed at the Presbyterian régime, and the majority of Scotsmen were not yet reconciled to the Union. The leader of the rising was the Earl of Mar, known as "Bobbing John" from the readiness with which he shifted from one party to the other. Though he had professed loyalty to George I he was dismissed from office, whereupon he went over to the Jacobites. When, 6 September, 1715, he set up the Stuart banner in the Highlands, thousands flocked to join him. But the clansmen could only be relied on for a short dashing campaign. As Mar proved dilatory and ineffective, his recruits began to dwindle, while the forces of the Duke of Argyle, whom the Government promptly sent against him, swelled in numbers each day.

Preston and Sheriff Muir (13 November, 1715). — Meantime, a small detachment from Mar's army, reënforced by a little contingent of Lowlanders and a body of Jacobite gentlemen from Cumberland and Westmoreland, crossed the Border and marched aimlessly south. At the fatal Preston they were hemmed in by two converging English armies and forced to surrender, 13 November, 1715. On the same day, the armies of Mar and Argyle met at Sheriff Muir. Though each was victorious against his opponent's left wing, Mar ingloriously withdrew his forces from the field. Argyle, content with having stopped the advance of the rebels, returned to his headquarters at Stirling.

The Arrival of the Pretender. The Final Collapse. — While Mar's forces were rapidly melting away, and, just as he had opened peace negotiations, the Pretender after unavoidable delays arrived, 22 December, with a single ship and attended by only eight gentlemen. Mar, directly he heard of his landing, hastened to meet him. He was proclaimed King, and the Jacobite ladies contributed their jewels to make him a crown. But he was in a desperate position. A Highland army, which had taken the Hanoverian side, was closing in on him from the north, while Argyle, reënforced by 6000 Dutch troops, was marching up from the south. Nor was James possessed of any personal qualities to inspire a forlorn hope. Mar speedily realized that there was nothing for it but to get him out of the country as soon as possible, so they speedily embarked for France, while the clansmen sullenly dispersed to their homes across the snow. James retired first to Avignon and thence to Rome. While still in France he foolishly dismissed Bolingbroke, the wisest counselor he had, who expressed a wish " that his arm might rot off if he ever again drew his sword or his pen " in his cause.

The Septennial Act (1716). — It was not because of its popularity that the Whig Government succeeded in defeating the designs of the Jacobites, and such little popularity as it enjoyed was bound to be diminished by the repressive measures which it was necessary to employ. Consequently, the Ministry was unwilling to run the risk of a general election at the end of another year. This was the real reason which led, in 1716, to the pasage of the Septennial Act, extending the possible duration of Parliament from three to seven years. The difficulty might have been met by a temporary measure; but it was thought wiser to justify the action on permanent grounds. The arrangement under the Triennial Act was open to serious objections. It was too great a strain on the country to choose representatives every three years at a time when elections were long, costly, and usually tumultuous. Also a longer term was necessary to protect

the members, on the one hand from the Crown and the peers who controlled many seats, and, on the other, although this is more questionable, from too great subservience to electors.

George's Journey to Hanover (1716). The European Situation. — No sooner was the danger from the Rebellion over, than George determined to visit his Hanoverian dominion. The restraining clause in the Act of Settlement — one of the chief difficulties in the way — was easily repealed without an opposing vote, for the Whigs were anxious to please the King, while the Tories, by making it possible for him to make frequent trips abroad, hoped to increase his unpopularity. Thereupon, 9 July, 1716, George started for Hanover, where the situation which he had to face was very disquieting. Among the European Powers he had only two sure friends and many enemies, active or passive.

The Triple Alliance (1716–1717). — The desire of the Regent of France to secure English support seemed to offer the best prospect of strength abroad and peace at home. An alliance with France seemed on the face of it such a reversal of traditional Whig policy that Townshend naturally hesitated; but, after all, the main aim of that party had been to secure the Revolution settlement and to prevent the French from securing the control of the Spanish colonies and trade. If both these objects could be secured by a diplomatic arrangement with the Regent there was no reason for continued hostility to France. Before the close of 1716 a treaty was signed by the British and French — in which the Dutch were to be included — providing that the Pretender should be excluded from France, and that the renunciation by Philip of the French throne should be confirmed. Thus the danger in the south was in a fair way to be averted; but the situation in the north continued threatening. Particularly, Peter the Great of Russia, anxious to secure a foothold in the Empire, had recently poured one army into the Duchy of Mecklenburg and quartered another in Denmark. George was anxious to employ the English fleet, which had been sent to the Baltic in July, 1715, to drive him out, but Townshend warmly opposed the project. He also withheld his assent to the Triple Alliance until he was assured of the willingness of the Dutch to join.[1]

The Cabinet Crisis of 1716–1717. — The remonstrances of George, backed by Denmark and the Emperor, finally induced the Tsar to recall his troops without war; but the attitude of Townshend contributed to a split in the Whig Ministry. Many other causes were at work to alienate the King from Townshend and his supporters; for

[1] They finally signed in January, 1717.

one thing, the German favorites, whose schemes for fleecing the English, Townshend rudely opposed, threw their influence against him; so the King dismissed him from office of Secretary in December. The prevailing Whig sentiment was glowing and resentful. They denounced the step as a proof of "the ascendancy of Continental politics over English concerns," and the period from 1717 to 1720, during which his successor, Earl Stanhope, was at the head of affairs, was known as that of the "German Ministry." It should be said, however, that he managed to avert danger from various European combinations, to foil the Jacobites in their attempts to launch another invasion, to strengthen British alliances abroad and to give his country a leading place in the councils of Europe.

Stanhope's Progressive Legislation (1717–1718). — In spite of discord, however, the session of 1717–1718 was fruitful in wise legislation. Among other measures, Stanhope carried into effect a scheme for the reduction of the National Debt — devised by Townshend's brother-in-law Walpole, before the former's dismissal — which marks the beginning of the English Sinking Fund. In 1718 he managed to secure the repeal of the Occasional Conformity Act of 1711 and the Schism Act of 1714. At the same time he tried and failed to do away with the Test and Corporation Acts; however, beginning in 1727, the custom arose of passing annual indemnity acts, protecting from punishment those who accepted office without taking the sacramental test; but the concession was churlish and unsatisfactory; for it purported to relieve only those who "through ignorance of the law, absence, or unavoidable accident" failed to qualify. Some who could allege none of these excuses were challenged, others were too scrupulous to take advantage of such an evasion of the law; but numbers of Dissenters were admitted to office in this way till the final repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts in 1828.

The National Debt and the South Sea Company. — On the whole, the Ministry seemed in a very strong position both at home and abroad, when the financial crash, known as the South Sea Bubble, came, and overthrew it within a few months. The National Debt now amounted to over £50,000,000, much of it burdened with 7 to 8 per cent interest, while private loans could be secured for 4 per cent. In view of the peaceful and prosperous condition of the country, the Government desired to cut down this rate of interest and to reduce the principal as rapidly as possible. There was the great difficulty, however, that a considerable portion of it was irredeemable, that is, it ran for long terms, some in the form of annuities, and could neither be paid nor the interest diminished without the consent of

the creditors. In 1711 Harley had funded £9,500,000 of the floating debt by the creation of the South Sea Company, which assumed the position of creditor in return for certain trading monopolies. In 1717 two schemes, devised by Walpole, were carried into effect by Stanhope for reducing the interest on a limited amount of the debt and for buying up the debts of a few of those who refused to accept a lower rate. But there still remained over £30,000,000 which the Government was anxious to group into a single fund, yielding only the market rate and redeemable at will.

The Company Takes Over the Debt (1720). — Since the South Sea Company desired to increase its capital, an arrangement was suggested whereby the holders of the outstanding debt should be paid in shares of the Company. Thus the Government was to have one creditor — a joint stock company — instead of many. It was to pay the company 5 per cent till 1727, and, from that date, 4 per cent until the principal should be finally paid, also to pay a liberal annual stipend for handling the business. The plan looked so tempting that other companies clamored for a share. Accordingly, they were given a chance to bid. The Bank of England proved to be the leading competitor, but the South Sea Company won by agreeing to pay a bonus of £7,500,000. Since no money was received from those who took stock in exchange for annuities, funds had to be raised to pay the bonus as well as to satisfy such creditors as refused to accept stock. At first, all went well, most of the annuitants accepted the Company's terms, and over £5,000,000 were subscribed in cash for new shares. But the arrangement resulted in disaster. In the first place, the Company had paid for more than it got, moreover, it burdened itself by the creation of additional blocks of stock which it actually gave away to influential members of the Government and Court favorites, while, worse than all, the project fostered a fever of speculation which was taking possession of the country. There was much money accumulating with few legitimate means of investing it. Before this speculative bubble burst, it had soared to dizzy heights. By August, 1720, the shares of the Company, which stood at £130 during the previous winter, had risen to £1000. In spite of a royal proclamation against "mischievous and dangerous undertakings . . . presuming" to raise "stocks and shares without legal authority" all sorts of schemes sprang up like Jonah's gourd, and the offices in Change Alley became so crowded that clerks had to transact business in the streets. Some were legitimate projects: for manufactures, paving, water works and the like; but most of them were absurd: for fishing up wrecks from off the Irish coast; making salt water fresh; securing

oil from sunflower seeds; for a wheel of perpetual motion; and most amazing of all, for "an undertaking in due time to be revealed." Before long it was estimated that £300,000,000 was invested, largely in crazy ventures.

The Bursting of the South Sea Bubble. — People's eyes were only opened when the South Sea Company, bent on monopolizing all the gain, began to prosecute certain of its bogus rivals. It won the suits, but at the same time gave a shock to public confidence which led to its own downfall. Shareholders began eagerly to offer their bonds for sale, and speedily came to realize the difference between paper promises and solid gain. By September, the Company's shares fell to £300, when news from France brought the crisis to a head. This was the flight of John Law, a Scotch adventurer who had set all Paris wild with his financial schemes, particularly his "Indian Company" for controlling the trade of the Mississippi. The rage of the disillusioned speculators flamed out against those to whose promises they had listened all too readily. "The very name of a South Sea Man" grew "abominable." Resentment spread to the Court favorites, to the Ministry, even to the King himself, and stocks fell to £135.

The End of the Stanhope Ministry and the Settlement of the Company's Affairs. — When Parliament met, the directors of the Company were ordered to lay a full account of their proceedings before the Houses: also bills were passed obliging them to declare on oath the value of their estates, prohibiting them from leaving the Kingdom, and offering rewards to informers. A committee of inquiry was appointed in the Commons, while several of the directors were examined in the Lords. The excitement was intense. Stanhope in the midst of a speech was attacked by a rush of blood to the head, and died the next day. Townshend replaced him as Secretary. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, deeply involved in the recent speculations, resigned; Walpole was appointed to fill the vacancy, and shortly after became First Lord of the Treasury as well. The committee report disclosed a mass of corruption, notably, that £500,000 of fictitious stock had been distributed among certain Ministers and favorites. Various resignations and removals followed. The directors suffered heavily; they were disabled from holding office or from sitting in Parliament, and their estates, amounting to £2,000,000, were appropriated for the unfortunate investors. Petitions poured in and pamphlets multiplied in which they were denounced as "monsters of pride and covetousness," "cannibals of Change Alley," and not a few demanded that they be hanged. Yet the people were, in no small degree, to

blame for their eagerness to make money; certainly, in spite of the bribery of those in high places, the Government had never guaranteed the credit of the Company. Before the inquiry was completed, Robert Walpole, to whom all eyes were turned, had proposed a scheme for restoring the public credit. While he had bought South Sea stock and had sold out at enormous profit, he had been so fortunate as to be out of office when the Government had made its arrangements with the Company. By his advice, the bonus which the latter had agreed to pay was practically remitted, its liabilities were settled, and what remained of the capital stock, about 33 per cent, was divided among the proprietors.

The Beginning of Walpole's Ascendancy. His Strength and Achievements. — Walpole now became chief Minister,[1] a position which he retained for over twenty years. The Tory party was handicapped by being more or less identified with the cause of the Roman Catholic Pretender and rebellion; but the Whig ascendancy would not have been so easily maintained had it not been for the great abilities of their leader as an administrator and as a party and parliamentary manager. He was not a man of ideals, neither was he strikingly brilliant or original, but he was essentially sane and efficient. His services to his country were many and great. He established the Hanoverian succession on a secure foundation; he gave England twenty years of peace and prosperity; he softened the bitterness of political and ecclesiastical faction, and raised the House of Commons to the leading position in the State. Remaining master of that body, he at the same time gained a firm hold on the confidence of two successive Kings, an achievement all the more remarkable from the fact that he aimed to keep clear of foreign complications, while both George I and George II were primarily interested in Continental affairs, and while the latter had a consuming ambition for military glory. Walpole was so economical that George I declared that he "could make gold from nothing." A typical squire, he worked for the support of the landed gentry, and had their strong support; but he held the commercial classes to him as well, by his knowledge of trade and finance, and his furtherance of their interests. He was a strict party disciplinarian who would brook no opposition in Cabinet or in Parliament, but he showed a deference to public opinion rare up to that time, and which marks him as the forerunner of the modern Minister.

His Faults and Limitations. — Yet, while Walpole's merits and services were great, they were counterbalanced by decided faults and

[1] Townshend confined himself almost solely to foreign affairs.

limitations, some of which were typical of the age and of his class. He was coarse in his conversation and loose in his private life. Although he had the welfare of his country at heart and was faithful to his Sovereign and never enriched himself at the public expense, he was greedy of power, he was unscrupulous in his party tactics, and utterly lacking in any high sense of honor; he made no effort to secure the passage of measures, however worthy, that might endanger his ascendancy,[1] and he finished his career by offering to give up his cherished policy of peace in order to remain at the head of affairs. He preferred to be served by those men of mediocre attainments and low standards of conduct who obeyed his will, and repelled gifted and high-minded men who might become his rivals. Then, too, his influence on the younger generation of statesmen was baneful: he scoffed at ideals of purity and patriotism, scornfully labeling those who professed them as "Spartans," "Romans," and "Saints." Patronage was to be regarded as legitimate for a long time to come, and Walpole used it openly and effectively; but the extent to which he employed money bribes for corrupting members of Parliament has never been proved. In all likelihood, however, it was great. Unfortunately, the practice did not begin or end with him. Nevertheless, this fact remains true that, during the long period of his ascendancy, he discouraged the coöperation of the nobler spirits, and not only did nothing to raise but much to depress the already low state of public morality. This must not be forgotten in giving him due credit for his great services in the material development of his country.

Death of George I (3 September, 1727). — Aside from an abortive project to coin halfpence for Ireland on terms which the inquiet genius of Swift, in his famous "Drapier Letters," magnified into a great oppression, the chief problems for the remainder of the reign centered in foreign affairs. Spain, bent on recovering Gibraltar, and infuriated because the Infanta, betrothed to Louis XV, had been repudiated for the daughter of the deposed King of Poland, made a strenuous effort to come to terms with the Emperor, to detach him from his alliance with France and Great Britain, and to stir up the Jacobites. George succeeded in checkmating these moves, but the situation remained tense. Such was the state of affairs when he died of an apoplectic fit on his way to Hanover, 3 June, 1727. He left the country united at home and powerful abroad. The dangers due to disputed succession had been averted, and the leading position which the genius of William and Marlborough had secured in European affairs had been not only maintained but increased. England was

[1] His motto was *quieta non movere*, do not stir up unnecessary strife.

the guiding spirit in Continental politics, her fleets dominated the Mediterranean and the Baltic, and she had frustrated the menacing combination of Spain and Austria.

The Material Bases of the Hanoverian Power. — The power of the first Hanoverian King rested on material bases — the Riot Act, the standing army, the attachment of the moneyed classes, and the organization of the Whig party, with a vast amount of patronage at its disposal and effectively led by Walpole, a master of the art of parliamentary management and corruption. As a further means of securing its tenure of power, the dominant régime made every effort to discredit its Tory opponents by identifying them with Jacobitism and all its dire consequences — the overthrow of the existing dynasty, the restoration of Roman Catholicism, and the repudiation of the National Debt. George recognized that he owed his position to Whig support. Partly for this reason and partly because of his ignorance of the English language and English ways, he gave the Whig leaders, especially Walpole, practically a free hand in matters of domestic concern. His Hanoverian favorites, while they enriched themselves at the public expense, exercised little real control over public policy. In consequence of the attitude which the King felt himself forced to adopt, he lost the advantage of playing off one party against another; but the growth of the Cabinet and the power of Parliament was greatly fostered. Although the King was strong in the strength of the party supporting him, the old sentiment and respect for the Monarch had declined. The title of the new line was parliamentary and the idea of Divine Right was fast fading away. The Whigs repudiated it; the Hanoverian Tories could not consistently maintain it, while the Jacobites, its most enthusiastic advocates, refused to acknowledge the reigning Sovereign. Furthermore, there was no reverend dignity about George to command exaggerated King worship. At his Court all pomp, ceremony, and superstitious reverence was done away with; he was not like his predecessors served on the knee at meals, and, with his accession, touching for the "King's evil" ceased.

The Character of the Age. — The age was one of coarseness in private life and of indifference to high ideals, and there was much corruption and venality. One Lord Chancellor was impeached for financial irregularities; three members of the Ministry were involved in the South Sea Scandals; favors and support were bought and sold; many, even in high office, engaged in the treasonable negotiations with the Pretender; and not a few took oaths which they did not believe for the sake of getting and holding places. Yet it is to be

doubted whether the tone of patriotism or sense of public obligation was lower than during the past two reigns, and peace, material progress, and the growth of enlightened public opinion were preparing the way for better things.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

Narrative and Constitutional. See works cited in ch. XXXVIII. Also, C. G. Robertson, *England under the Hanoverians* (1911); Lord Mahon (Earl Stanhope), *History of England from the Peace of Utrecht to the Peace of Versailles* (4th ed., 1853, 7 vols.).

Biography. W. Coxe, *Memoirs of the Life and Administration of Sir Robert Walpole* (3 vols., 1798). J. Morley (Viscount), *Sir Robert Walpole* (1889), an excellent sketch.

Special. G. B. Hertz, *British Imperialism in the Eighteenth Century* (1908). J. F. Chance, *George I, and the Great Northern War* (1909). A. W. Ward, *Great Britain and Hanover* (1899). Thackeray's *Four Georges* is worth reading chiefly for its literary charm.

Church. Overton and Relton, *The English Church*, 1714–1800 (1906). For other references see Chapter XXXVIII above.

Selections from sources. Adams and Stephens, nos. 246–248, Robertson, pt. I, XXV–XXVIII.

CHAPTER XL

THE ASCENDANCY AND FALL OF WALPOLE AND THE OPENING OF A NEW ERA OF WAR. THE FIRST PART OF THE REIGN OF GEORGE II (1727–1748)

George II as Man and King. — George II, who was born in Hanover in 1683, was a mature man when he accompanied his father to England in 1714. Adapting himself with considerable readiness to his new surroundings, he was able to achieve some popularity and to attract around him a considerable party of supporters which only widened the breach already opened between him and the elder George. The new King was a dapper little man, vain, pompous, and fond of the show of power. Also he was madly ambitious to shine as a general; though, while he fought bravely in more than one battle, he never showed any military ability. His temper was very gusty; yet he was very methodical, fond of detail, and had considerable capacity for routine business. Though avarice, or at least extreme thriftiness, was one of his marked traits, he died comparatively poor, which has led to the conclusion that he must have spent much on his Hanoverian dominions. In foreign policy he was an opportunist without consistency of purpose, though, in general, he put Hanoverian and Imperial before English interests. In domestic politics he was timid and cautious, except for occasional outburst, of choler. Yet his lack of political courage led to a moderation and prudence of conduct which had a most happy effect on the growth of the constitutional government; during his whole reign he never once invaded the rights of the subjects, or sought to reassert the declining royal prerogative. Moreover, in the midst of George's faults, two virtues stand out conspicuously — petty, spiteful, and ungracious as he was, he was absolutely a man of his word, and, though he gave his confidence grudgingly, he never withdrew it from a Minister who proved worthy.

Queen Caroline (1683–1737). — In 1705 he married Caroline of Anspach, fondly known as "Caroline the Good." Though he neglected and abused her, she gained such an ascendancy over him that

she and Walpole came to be regarded as "the King's two ears." Patient and gracious, she was gifted with a keen sense of humor and uncommon tact; understanding her Consort thoroughly, she realized that he could be easily led but never driven. Her death in 1737 was a sad loss to the country.

The Strength of Walpole's Government. — Again at the accession of George II, the Pretender, who nourished hopes from a change of dynasty, was doomed to disappointment. There was a noisy opposition in Parliament, which Bolingbroke helped to organize,[1] made up of discontented Whigs, Jacobites, and Hanoverian Tories, who called themselves the "Patriots"; but they were too divided in their personal and political interests to pull strongly together. Outside, the Government was fiercely assailed in the *Craftsman* — a brilliantly written sheet — and other weekly periodicals as well as in pamphlets and ballads, though to little practical effect. The speeches of the Opposition speakers were prevented from circulating by Parliament's jealous refusal to allow its debates to be printed, and Walpole's peaceful, businesslike administration made for prosperity and contentment among the influential classes. Moreover, the Duke of Newcastle, a Secretary of State for thirty years, was, in spite of his apparent fussy ineffectiveness and his absurd timidity, an adroit political manager, and by his vast control of patronage, pensions, and boroughs, held Parliament in the hollow of his hand.

Walpole becomes Prime and Sole Minister. — Not only was Walpole able to frustrate attacks in Parliament, but he managed to make himself supreme in the Cabinet, thus becoming the first "Prime Minister" in the modern sense of the term, though the name was first applied to him by his enemies. His brother-in-law, Townshend, who, since his return to office in 1721, had devoted himself exclusively to foreign affairs, resigned, 16 May, 1730, and retired to his estates. One or two measures of reform were carried in the years immediately following. In 1731 it was provided, in spite of stout opposition from many lawyers and judges, that the proceedings in the courts of justice should henceforth be in English instead of Latin. "Our prayers," urged one eloquent advocate, "are in our native tongue, that they may be intelligible, and why should not the laws wherein our lives and properties are concerned be so for the same reason?"

Walpole's Excise (1733). — The Government was at the height of its popularity when Walpole introduced an excise scheme in 1733 which, in spite of its obvious merits, roused such a howl of opposition that

[1] Although he was allowed to return to the country in 1723, he was still excluded from the House of Lords and lived at some distance from London.

he bowed to the storm and abandoned the measure. As a means of strengthening himself in the support of the county aristocracy he reduced the land tax from two shillings in the pound to one, which obliged him to resort to various substitutes. A measure to impose an internal tax on salt, which bore rather heavily on the poorer class, was carried by a small majority. When this proved inadequate, Walpole introduced a measure providing that, in the case of tobacco and wine, the customs duty at the ports should be abolished and that, in its place, an excise should be imposed on retail traders. At the same time, goods bonded for reëxport were to be warehoused free of duty. The plan had much to commend it. It would do away with smuggling in these commodities, which prevailed to such an extent that £500,000 a year was lost out of a possible £750,000. Moreover, prices were not raised, while, by the warehousing provision, London would become a free port and the center of the world's markets.

The Opposition and Withdrawal of the Measure. — At once, however, the Opposition fomented an indignation which spread throughout the land. The excise was denounced as a "many-headed monster, which was to devour the people,"[1] and as a "plan of arbitrary power." The number of collectors required was magnified into a standing army who would be employed as creatures of the Government to control elections, while the right to enter and search places where goods were stored was condemned as an inquisitorial attack on liberty. There was certainly good ground for objecting to the increase of placemen; but the number required was only 126, and they were to have power to search only shops and warehouses, not private dwellings. These assurances, however, fell on deaf ears. During the debates crowds surged about the Parliament House threatening and yelling. Pamphlets multiplied, and petitions poured in from all quarters. "The public was so heated" that rebellion was threatened. While he still had a small though decreasing majority for his bill, Walpole, yielding to the popular clamor, quietly withdrew it; for he regarded it as impolitic to cross the will of the people, even for their good. Toward his colleagues who opposed him he took a different attitude, depriving them of their offices at Court or of their commissions in the army. Some might regard this as a "monstrous piece of resentment," but Walpole, by thus punishing men in official

[1] So late as 1755 Dr. Johnson, in the first edition of his famous *Dictionary*, defined an excise as "hateful tax levied upon commodities, and adjudged not by common judges of property, but by wretches hired by those to whom the excise is paid."

position who opposed a Government measure, took a long step in the direction of party unity under the chief of the Cabinet.

Quarrels between George II and Prince Frederick. — All the while, Walpole had to face scathing attacks from the Patriots, who denounced him as "a man abandoned to all notions of virtue and honor . . . afraid or unwilling to trust any but creatures of his own making . . . with a Parliament of his own making, most of their seats purchased, and their votes bought at the public expense." However, he managed after great exertion — spending, it is said, £60,000 of his private fortune — to win a good, though decreased majority for the Parliament of 1735. Bolingbroke in despair left the country. Although he returned later, he never again mingled actively in party politics. After the withdrawal of the old Tory chief, the Opposition began to center about Frederick, Prince of Wales, who was engaged in constant quarrels with his royal father. This estrangement between father and son, unedifying as it was, was really a source of strength to the dynasty, for many of the Tories who had only seen a way to power through the Stuarts now began to fix their hopes on Frederick.

Troubles with Spain. — The death of Queen Caroline, 20 November, 1737, deprived Walpole of his stanchest supporter. He kept his office over four years longer; but his peace policy, more and more fiercely assailed, at length broke down. Even the King, while he refused to accept his resignation, constantly thwarted his foreign negotiations in order to force him into a warlike attitude. In the end he yielded to the clamors of the Opposition, but too late to save his place. The trouble started with Spain. There were several causes of friction, but the most acute and important concerned trade relations, rising from the determination of the English to break down the colonial monopoly to which the Spanish clung so jealously. Though withdrawn for a time, the commercial concessions made to England by the Peace of Utrecht had been later renewed; but each nation was allowed the right to search and the seizure of contraband goods. While the Spanish exercised their rights with rigor and cruelty, the English, to the total disregard of treaty obligations, were guilty of shameless smuggling. Fleets were constantly putting into Spanish-American ports under pretense of refitting, really to buy and sell goods. Others lay off shore where they were visited by hosts of illicit traders. The one ship allowed by the *Asiento* was moored a short distance from the coast and continually loaded and unloaded. Cases of violence and indignities which English seamen suffered at the hands of the Spanish coast-guard were indignantly

emphasized, while the violations of the law which called them forth were veiled in discreet silence. The ungracious delay of the Court at Madrid in redressing actual grievances only added fuel to the flames.

The Case of Jenkins's Ear (1738). — Parliament was flooded with petitions from the merchants demanding redress. Sailors were posted in the Exchange, exhibiting specimens of the loathsome food they had to eat in Spanish dungeons. Some, brought before the bar of the Commons, told their stories in minute and harrowing detail. While there was some truth in what they said, they were not examined under oath. Moreover, they were encouraged by partisan zeal, even by bribes, to exaggerate and invent. The tale of a shipmaster, Robert Jenkins, related in March, 1738, aroused the chief interest. According to his account, his ship had been boarded, 9 April, 1731, by a body of the Spanish coast-guard, and the captain had cut off one of his ears. He produced as evidence the severed member, which he had carried wrapped in cotton, ever since. In reply to the question as to what he had done, he replied: "I commended my soul to God and my cause to my country." While this stirring phrase, which became famous, was very likely coined for him, it is now believed that he lost his ear in the manner he described, and not in the pillory as some have hinted. With a number even of his own colleagues against him, Walpole struggled in vain to stem the swelling tide of anti-Spanish opposition. The cry of "no search" ran "from the sailor to the merchant, from the merchant to the Parliament," and the Lords carried a resolution denying the right.

Walpole Forced to Declare War (23 October, 1739). — The Prime Minister, while admitting that the English merchants and sailors had grievances, still hoped to settle them by treaty. At the same time, he sought to put pressure on the Court at Madrid by preparations for war. In consequence, the Spanish released several prizes and captives, and signed a Convention by which they agreed to pay £95,000 damages to English merchants. When it became known that no provision had been made to limit the right of search, to punish those who had inflicted cruelities on English sailors, or to settle other outstanding questions, the Convention was furiously denounced. Walpole in his defense declared in words which have become famous: "Any peace is preferable even to successful war." In spite of French efforts to mediate, Walpole finally realized that he must either declare war or resign. So he framed a series of demands, including absolute renunciation of the right of search, immediate payment of the £95,000 fixed by the Convention, and an express acknowledgment

of British claims in North America. When the Spanish rejected the ultimatum, war was declared, 23 October, 1739.

Walpole and the War. — Regardless of the prosperity which they had enjoyed during the long years of peace, the English people, anticipating much plunder and an easy victory, went mad with joy. "They may ring bells now," murmured Walpole; "before long they will be wringing their hands." He foresaw, as the country at large did not, the dangers involved in the course so jauntily entered upon. He knew that France and Spain had allied themselves in a Family Compact in 1733, and, although the French had striven for peace, they were bound sooner or later to make common cause with Spain. Moreover, the Jacobites were again active, and, as events soon showed, were to prove a serious menace. While the responsibility for stirring the national resentment to a war fever rests with the Opposition, Walpole must be blamed for yielding that he might cling to office. Possibly he felt that, if a conflict were inevitable, he was more capable of bringing it to a successful conclusion than any other man of the time; still there is no doubt that love of power warped his judgment, and he made the supreme mistake of his life in undertaking to carry on a war which he believed was neither just nor expedient. In vain the once domineering Minister made concessions, for his old opponents and the "Boy Patriots" whom they had trained were bent on driving him out. Against this formidable combination he had to fight practically alone, since he had on his side only men of mediocre attainments or damaged character. Thus he paid the penalty for his jealousy of rivals in office.

The War of Jenkins's Ear (1739–1741). — Meantime, 19 July, 1739, three months before the war was formally declared, Admiral Vernon was sent to the Spanish-American waters with instructions "to destroy the Spanish settlements and to distress their shipping." On 21 November he took by assault Porto Bello on the Isthmus of Panama, an important station for fitting out the *guarda-costas* or revenue cutters. But his triumph was offset two years later, when, with a great fleet and a large army, his attempt to capture Cartagena, "the strongest place in Spanish America," resulted in disastrous failure.

The Opening of the War of the Austrian Succession (1740). — On 20 October, 1740, the Emperor Charles VI died. Having no sons, he had, by the so-called Pragmatic Sanction,[1] provided that his Austrian lands should descend to his eldest daughter, Maria Theresa,

[1] A term of various meanings, among others, an arrangement made by a ruler for settling the succession of his family lands.

married to Francis, Grand Duke of Tuscany. England, who had pledged herself in 1725 to accept this arrangement, at once found her conflict with Spain merged into a grave European complication, the War of the Austrian Succession. Various male members of the Hapsburg House set up a claim to the family inheritance,[1] but at length united to support the pretensions of Charles Albert of Bavaria. At the same time a new Power loomed up in the horizon. Frederick, known to history as "The Great," who had succeeded to the throne of Prussia the previous May, advanced a claim to a portion of the Austrian province of Silesia with the ultimate intention of absorbing the whole. Frederick, a grim and ruthless figure, proved to be a military genius, a statesman and an administrator of the first rank. Strengthened by the financial resources and the standing army built up by his testy, avaricious, and eccentric father, Frederick William, he succeeded by an amazing clarity of vision, by sleepless vigilance, and by unremitting perseverance and toil in perfecting a model State of the despotic type and forcing it into the front rank of European Powers. In the conflict which he now entered he allied himself with France, Spain, Bavaria, and Saxony, and the first two Silesian wars (1740–1742 and 1744–1745) proved to be significant factors in the general war of the Austrian Succession. Hard beset by a Prussian army in Silesia and by a combined French, Bavarian, and Saxon army in Bohemia, the young Maria Theresa was confronted with a gloomy prospect. At Frankfort, 14 February, 1742, Charles Albert was elected Emperor under the title of Charles VII.

The Fall of Walpole (1742). — With the new turn of affairs on the Continent the attacks against Walpole increased in intensity. While one of the main charges against him was that he had made himself "prime and sole Minister," various unfortunte events for which he was in no way to blame added to his unpopularity, among them Vernon's failure at Cartagena and heavy commercial losses due to Spanish attacks on English shipping. However, he fought on with amazing resourcefulness, keenness, and courage until, after his party had been defeated by sixteen votes in a petition relating to a disputed election, he was finally persuaded that his retirement was absolutely necessary, and 11 February, 1742, he resigned all his offices, though not before he had made extremely favorable terms for himself and his family. He was created Earl of Orford and received other marks of royal favor; moreover, during the three remaining years of his life he continued to exert such an influence on public

[1] The office of Emperor was elective, but for centuries the head of the House of Austria had been chosen.

affairs as to justify in some measure the popular outcry that he was "still Minister behind the curtain." Material as were his interests, his achievements gave him a leading place "amongst the master workers of modern Great Britain." Much to the disappointment of the Tories, who clamored for an administration founded "on a broad bottom of both parties," the Whig régime continued with a few changes in personnel.

The Course of the War (1742–1743). — England now plunged into the thick of the Continental struggle. During the session of 1742 a subsidy of £500,000 was granted to Maria Theresa, £5,000,000 was voted for troops and supplies, and an auxiliary force of 16,000 men was sent to the Netherlands. While, owing to the lack of Dutch coöperation, they did little during the whole year but quarrel with the inhabitants, the armies of the Empress gained ground against the French in Bohemia and in the valley of the Danube. In the early summer of 1742 Frederick the Great concluded a peace which put an end to the first Silesian War and withdrew temporarily from the anti-Austrian alliance. This was a welcome relief to Maria Theresa, though the concession of the greater part of Silesia which it involved was a sore blow to her pride. George, anxious alike to protect his Electoral dominions and to emulate William of Orange as the head of a great Continental alliance, was eager to dash actively into the fray. Already, before his fall, Walpole had concluded a treaty for subsidizing a force of 6000 Hessians. Now the King and the Secretary of State for Northern Affairs, without consulting Parliament, arranged to take 16,000 Hanoverians into the British pay. Parliamentary sanction was secured only in the teeth of the bitterest opposition; yet the step had the advantage of stirring the Dutch to furnish a contingent, while King George levied 6000 more of his Hanoverian subjects whom he paid with Electoral money.

The Battle of Dettingen (27 June, 1743). — Toward the end of 1742, he sought to provide against a possible French attack by defensive alliances with Prussia and Austria, and, in February, 1743, the English forces in the Netherlands started east and south with the object of cutting off the French from their Bavarian allies. On the march they were joined by some Austrian forces and by the Hanoverians in British pay. Halfway between Mainz and Frankfort on the north bank of the Main, they sat down to await the Hessians and the Hanoverian reënforcements which had been levied with Electoral money. Meantime, a French army had also crossed the Rhine and approached the Main from the south. Strangely enough, neither France nor England had as yet declared war on one another, but were merely

supporting their respective allies. On 27 June, the two armies fought a desperate battle near the little village of Dettingen. In spite of the valor shown by George II,[1] who had just joined his army in person, it was only the rashness of one of the French generals that enabled the Pragmatic[2] forces to rout the enemy, who had well-nigh hemmed them in, and to cut their way through. Thus the battle of Dettingen was "a happy escape" rather than a great victory. An Imperial force succeeded in driving across the Rhine another French army operating in Bavaria, with the result that, by the end of the campaign of 1743, German soil had been completely cleared of the invader.

England and France as Principals in the War. — Impelled by fear and hatred of her ancient rival, France now drew closer to Spain. By the Second Family Compact, concluded 25 October, 1743, she promised to assist Spain to recover Gibraltar and Minorca and to destroy the colony of Georgia, while Spain, on her part, agreed to transfer to France the privileges formerly accorded to England under the *Asiento*. The whole face of the war had been changed by the events of the past year. England, first coming into conflict with Spain over trade disputes in the western world, had been drawn into the European struggle as the ally of Maria Theresa, for the purpose of maintaining the Pragmatic Sanction and the integrity of the Austrian lands. Now she and France had been brought face to face as principals. George, "greedy for glory," had not only sent contingents to fight the French but had actually gone in person to lead them. Maria Theresa, more aspiring still and thirsting for revenge against the Powers who had combined against her, was determined to secure the Imperial crown for her husband Francis and to extend her territories. So far as France and England were concerned, the area of the conflict was not confined to Europe, but spread to America and India. These two Powers were to emerge more clearly than ever before as rivals for maritime and colonial supremacy.

The Ministry of Henry Pelham (1743–1754). — Meantime, Newcastle, with the support of Orford, succeeded in securing for his brother, Henry Pelham, the office of Prime Minister, which he retained until his death eleven years later. "A politician without any commanding abilities," he proved to be a capable and economical financier as well as an excellent parliamentary manager. George and his Foreign Minister were sharply attacked on the ground that they were assuming for Great Britain an increasing burden of the expenses of the War, and mainly in the interest of Hanover, but the

[1] The last instance where an English King led his army in person.

[2] So called because they were fighting to maintain the Pragmatic Sanction.

Opposition was momentarily silenced by the news that the French were preparing another expedition in favor of the Pretender.

The Attempted French Invasion and the Reciprocal Declarations of War (1744). — Since his father no longer cherished any illusions and was completely discredited by repeated failure and by constant quarrels with his followers, the hopes of the Jacobites centered in "Prince Charlie." The young Pretender, now in his twenty-fourth year, was handsome, gracious, dignified, and brave, endowed with all the charm and enthusiasm of youth. However, owing to a heavy storm and to the vigilance of the British fleet, an invading expedition which he joined in 1744 never got across the Channel. The only result was a declaration of war by both countries. That of Louis XV was issued 4 March, alleging, as its chief reason, that England had broken the peace by her expedition to Germany. The English replied 29 March, asserting, among other grounds, the violation of the Pragmatic Sanction, aid to Spanish privateers in the West Indies, and the attempted invasion of England.

The Battle of Fontenoy (1745). — The Dutch now entered the war, and the campaign of 1745 centered in the Netherlands, where the French with a greatly superior army defeated a combined force of the Austrians, British, and Dutch at Fontenoy, 11 May, and before the close of the summer was practically in control of Flanders. These and other reverses of the English and their allies were offset by a few gains, chiefly diplomatic. Frederick had entered the war again, 10 August, 1744; but after he had driven a combined army of Austrians and Saxons from Silesia into Bohemia, the English Cabinet, holding before him the danger of French ascendancy, induced him to listen to terms. In return for the cession of Silesia, Frederick agreed to acknowledge Maria Theresa's husband as Emperor. By the Peace concluded 25 December, 1745, the Second Silesian War came to an end.

The Capture of Louisburg (1745). — Meantime, in North America, the New England militia, assisted by a British fleet, had gained a brilliant success by the capture of Louisburg, 17 June, 1745. This stronghold, situated on Cape Breton Island, had been fortified by the French at great expense. It was one of the most important positions in the New World, for it commanded the mouth of the St. Lawrence, it controlled the North American fisheries, and had served the French as a naval base both for their operations against New England and for securing their communications between France and Canada.

The Coming of Prince Charlie (25 July, 1745). — Encouraged by the reverses of the English and their allies in Flanders, Prince

Charlie, 2 July, 1745, embarked from the coast of France and sailed for Scotland in a final attempt to recover the throne of his ancestors. Perhaps the most romantic episode in the history of a country of valorous and desperate exploits, the Rising of 1745 [1] was undertaken in the face of every chance of failure. Unsupported by a single European Power the Young Pretender landed on the west coast of Scotland, 25 July, with only seven companions, trusting alone to his personal charm and his family name. Of the Highland clans who responded to his call most were destitute of discipline, torn by jealousy, and primarily concerned in plundering their enemies. In the Lowlands, while there was some enthusiasm for the Stuart name and a lingering discontent against the Union, the growing commercial and industrial element saw that their best interests were bound up with the existing Government. Moreover, the English Jacobites, notwithstanding the fact that the King was abroad and most of the British army was absent in the Netherlands, made little or no effort to organize an insurrection.

His Occupation of Edinburgh (17 September), Prestonpans (21 September). — Having won over a few of the western chiefs, Charles raised his standard, 19 August, in a dreary Highland vale. Such was the magic of his presence and his name that many, from a glorious but mistaken loyalty and against their better judgment, flocked to join him. Others held aloof, waiting upon events. Practically unobstructed by the forces of Sir John Cope, the Hanoverian commander, the invader hurried to Edinburgh. On the way he was joined by Lord George Murray, a veteran of 1715, who rendered effective service as a general, but added another element of discord by his hot temper and overbearing manner. On 17 September, after overcoming a feeble opposition to his advance, Prince Charlie entered the panic-stricken capital. As he rode through the town, in a tartan coat, wearing a blue bonnet surmounted by a white cockade, he was welcomed with raptures by the Jacobites. After a brief rest he marched forth to meet Cope, who had taken ship at Aberdeen, landed at Dunbar, and was on his way westward. The two armies joined battle, 21 September, near the village of Prestonpans.[2] Cope's forces, unable to withstand the terrific onslaught of the Highlanders, were routed completely in little more than five minutes. Unable to rally the remnants, Sir John joined in the flight across the Border.

The Pretender Invades England (31 October, 1745). — Charles was for pushing on at once for London while the Government was still

[1] It has been immortalized in literature in Sir Walter Scott's *Waverley*.

[2] Not to be confused with Preston in Lancashire.

unprepared, but his advisers urged him to wait for reënforcements and for supplies. So many of his Highlanders had gone home with their plunder that he was obliged to yield, and remained in Edinburgh gathering recruits. The delay destroyed any chance of success that he may have had. George II returned from Hanover, 31 August, the Dutch were called on to furnish 6000 auxiliaries that they were bound by treaty to supply, the militia were mustered in several counties, and General Wade was ordered to collect an army at Newcastle. The mass of the people remained indifferent; but the Government made itself stronger every day. Charles, who had been drilling his motley following and doing his best to hold them in restraint, began his invasion of England, 31 October, taking the western route to avoid General Wade. Dressed in Highland garb the Prince marched on foot, sharing the hardships of the common soldier, paying for all he took and maintaining admirable discipline. Yet the position of the invaders grew every day more desperate. Hanoverian forces began to recover control in Scotland; regiments from Flanders were hurried to England, and the Dutch auxiliaries soon arrived; General Wade was advancing through Yorkshire; the Duke of Cumberland, a son of the King, had collected an army in the Midlands; a third force was forming just north of London for the defense of the City, while fleets patroled the Channel to intercept any possible aid from France.

The Retreat to Scotland. — Charles, whose courage and enthusiasm never waned, managed to elude Cumberland and to get as far as Derby, situated only one hundred and twenty-seven miles north of London. There, Lord George Murray and the other leaders insisted on turning back, but it was only with the utmost difficulty that they persuaded Charles against pressing on to certain destruction. The retreat was a striking contrast to the advance. Discipline was relaxed, and the embittered Highlanders ruthlessly plundered the countryside, causing the hostility to the "wild petticoat men" to grow steadily more intense. Cumberland started in hot pursuit, but on a false report that the French were preparing to land, gave up the chase. The retreating army succeeded in recrossing the border and, 26 December, reached Glasgow, having accomplished the extraordinary feat of marching nearly six hundred miles in fifty-six days.

The Defeat of Culloden (16 April, 1746). — Although the Pretender defeated one Government force on the Scottish side of the Border, it did him no good. New dissensions arose, the clansmen dispersed with their booty, and Cumberland was sent to take command in Scotland. Again Murray persuaded Charles to retreat, this time to the Highlands, where he might spend the winter in recruiting and preparing

for the spring campaign. As the season advanced, the suffering of his troops became pitiful. The district where they were quartered was bleak and barren, they were cut off from the richer Lowlands whence they might have drawn means of subsistence, and most of the supplies from France were intercepted. Early in April, Cumberland, who had finally got his army in fighting shape, marched from Aberdeen with 9000 well armed and well fed troops to offer battle. At Culloden Moor about five miles east of Inverness, he attacked, on the 16th, Charles's little army of 5000 which, half-starved and nearly blinded by a storm of wind and hail which blew directly in their faces, were ill fitted for effective resistance. The army of the Pretender was destroyed, his cause was ruined.

Cumberland's Butchery and the Flight of Prince Charlie. — Cumberland earned his name of "The Butcher" by the ferocity with which he hunted down, slew and even tortured the vanquished, and pillaged and destroyed their property.[1] Many who escaped perished from hunger and exposure. Lord George Murray made a vain effort to rally the clans; but Charles, thanking them for their zeal, bade them seek safety. Lord George himself escaped to Holland. For five months, from April to September, Charles wandered about a fugitive, sometimes on the main land, sometimes among the islands off the coast. In spite of a reward of £30,000 offered for his capture no one could be found to betray him. It was during this period of exposure that he contracted the habit of drunkenness which later proved his ruin. At length, in September, he was shipped out of the country from the very place where he had landed fourteen months before. Unfortunately, except for occasional flashes of his old courage and generosity, his later life was sad and inglorious. Driven from France, he wandered about Europe and finally took refuge in Italy. He died in Rome, 31 January, 1788. With the death of his brother Henry, Cardinal of York, in 1807, the male line of the House of Stuart became extinct.

The Transformation of Scotland after the Union. — Happily, the repression of the rising of 1745 and the measures that followed completed the social and economic transformation of Scotland which had been going on since the Union. Before that time the Highlands had been inaccessible and barbaric; the clans formed a group of petty kingdoms, each under an hereditary chief who knew no law but tribal law, while the clansmen, scorning labor, left their women and children to gather such scanty crops as their barren lands afforded, and devoted

[1] Though some maintain that his responsibility for the cruelties after Culloden has been exaggerated.

themselves to the chase, to cattle raids and fighting. The Lowlands, where the chief industrial energy and progressiveness centred, were handicapped by a bare, rugged soil, by exposure to attack from the north and south, religious persecution and rigid exclusion from English markets. The period following the Revolution and the Union marked a turning point in their history. Presbyterianism was restored, schools were established, and with the removal of restrictions on commerce, trade and manufactures began to flourish. The Highlands remained for a long time untouched by the change, in spite of various innovations. Parochial schools were set up with a view to rooting out the Gaelic tongue, a barrier to rapid assimilation. After 1715 an attempt was made to disarm the clansmen; but the inaccessible character of the country proved a serious obstacle to its enforcement. In 1726, however, General Wade began the construction of roads, which, completed in a little over ten years, greatly facilitated the efforts of the Government in dealing with the disaffected and in opening up the remote districts to civilizing influences.

After the Rising. — The crushing of the Rebellion completed what the rise of the Lowland industrial class, the extension of education, and the new roads had begun. Many powerful chieftains were forced to go into exile, others were ruined, so that ties which bound them to their clansmen were naturally weakened. In addition, a series of important measures were passed in 1746, which swept away the last vestiges of the old clan organization. One abolished all "heritable jurisdictions," providing £152,000 by way of compensation. Another made the Disarming Act a reality and prohibited under severe penalties any but soldiers from wearing the national dress. English Ministers, however, wisely enlisted Highland regiments in the British service, who by their valiant achievements aroused a sense of national loyalty which went far to soften the animosity called forth by the previous measures of repression. Much of the old time chivalry and romance and picturesqueness passed away and no little temporary distress resulted; for the old chiefs who had been fathers to their people were often replaced by rapacious landlords intent on squeezing a profit from the tenants. But by the extension of schools, by the introduction of improved methods of agriculture and cattle breeding, by the encouragement of the fisheries and the development of the linen industry and stocking-weaving, and by the enforcement of law, thrift and security came to prevail over disorder and poverty. Naturally, the growth of wealth and industry was small compared with that of the Lowlands; but, nevertheless, it was striking. Throughout the country much that was sordid and miserable remained, while the

despotism of the Church and the gloomy Sabbath tended to darken and deaden the national character; but the native shrewdness of the Scot, his frugality and diligence, led him to achieve great things at home and to bring him to the front ranks wherever he went.

The Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle (1748). — The recall of the English troops to deal with the rising of the Scots had left the Allies even more at the mercy of the French in the Netherlands than they had been before. On the other hand, Austria had been relieved by the withdrawal of both Prussia and Bavaria from the war and by the death, 9 July, 1746, of Philip V of Spain, whose son and successor, Ferdinand VI, was pacifically inclined. Bereft of two allies, languidly supported by a third, alarmed at the increasing debt, unsuccessful against the Austrians in Italy, and with the St. Lawrence and Canada threatened by the capture of Louisburg, the French were ready to listen to terms of peace; but the English demands were so high that the struggle dragged on for more than a year longer, during which French gains in the Netherlands were about balanced by British successes at sea. At length, the question of peace was referred to a congress called to meet at Aix-la-Chapelle, where the English and the Dutch finally signed preliminaries, 30 April, 1748, without waiting for their Austrian allies. The chief terms were: (1) The mutual restoration of all conquests; (2) The Asiento was to be revived for four years; (3) The Protestant Succession was again guaranteed and the exclusion of the Pretender and his family from France confirmed; (4) The Emperor Francis was to be acknowledged by France and the Pragmatic Sanction renewed; (5) Silesia was to remain in the hands of the King of Prussia. The Empress Maria Theresa protested bitterly, and at first refused to confirm the preliminaries; but, after tiresome negotiations, a definitive peace was finally signed, 18 October.

The Results of the War. — Curiously enough, the issue in which England and Spain had originally gone to war — the right of search — was passed over without mention, while England and France, after a tremendous expenditure of men and money, remained in much the same position as before. On the other hand, the Austrian lands and the Imperial title had been preserved to the daughter of Austrian Hapsburgs, though at the cost of Silesia; Holland, already seriously weakened in the previous struggles with France, finally ceased to be a great Power; while Prussia, destined in another war to be the most effective ally of Great Britain and a dominating force in Europe, had made her way into the front ranks of European States. It was only late in the struggle that England had asserted the maritime supremacy that had once been hers, and which she was soon to demonstrate again so

signally. On land she had been beaten "on every spot which my lord Marlborough had conquered." When, after a brief interval of repose, the conflict was again resumed, William Pitt, a remarkable young man who had been given a subordinate place in the Ministry in 1746, was to show that his country's primary mission was not to devote her best strength to fighting France in the Netherlands and in Germany, but to bend her main energies to mastering her great rival on the sea, in America and in India.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

See Chapter XLI below.

CHAPTER XLI

THE DUEL FOR EMPIRE. THE CLOSING YEARS OF GEORGE II'S REIGN (1748–1760)

The Reform of the Calendar (1751). — The Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle was followed in England by several years of political tranquillity, during which two notable reforms were carried through. The first was the reform of the Calendar. The English year began on "Lady Day," 25 March,[1] and owing to an ancient astronomical error, her reckoning was eleven days wrong. The "new" or corrected style had been brought into general use in Europe, in 1582, by Pope Gregory XIII. Only Sweden, Russia,[2] and England clung to the "old style," partly from conservatism, partly because the innovation was a "Popish" measure. In England the change was proposed by Lord Chesterfield, and was worked out with the aid of two prominent mathematicians. New Year's Day was changed to 1 January, and the day following 2 September, 1752, was called the 14th. Although the measure was easily carried through Parliament, the opposition outside was for some time intense: "Give us back our eleven days" being a popular cry in the next election.

Lord Hardwicke's Marriage Bill (1753). — The other measure — the Marriage Act of 1753 — did away with a crying abuse. Hitherto marriages could be celebrated by a priest at any time and place without previous notice or registration, and without the knowledge and consent of either parent or guardian, even if the parties were minors. Consequently, disreputable parsons, usually prisoners for debt, did a thriving business in joining runaway couples, as well as young heirs and heiresses entrapped by unscrupulous persons. This nefarious work centered chiefly in and about the "Fleet."[3] Almost every neighboring tavern and grog shop had a "Fleet parson" in its pay. In one period of four months nearly 3000 "Fleet marriages" were performed. Once joined, the tie was almost indissoluble, since

[1] The Feast of the Annunciation of the Virgin Mary.

[2] Russia still retains it.

[3] A celebrated debtors' prison in London.

divorces could only be secured by Act of Parliament. Various attempts to remedy the evil proved ineffective till Lord Hardwicke's celebrated Act of 1753, which provided that, except in the case of Quakers and Jews, no marriages should be valid which were not celebrated according to the Anglican liturgy by a priest of the Church of England. Furthermore, banns must be published in the parish church for three successive weeks. The only alternative was a special license issued by the Archbishop of Canterbury and very costly. In the case of minors, such licenses could not be procured without the consent of parents or guardians. Parsons celebrating marriages contrary to law were liable to transportation. The new arrangement was naturally a grievance to Dissenters; but the evils that it remedied were greater than the hardships it caused, and the Act continued in force for nearly a century.

The Newcastle Ministry (1754–1756), and the Outbreak of the Seven Years' War (1756–1763). — The death of Henry Pelham, 6 March, 1754, put an end to the prevailing political calm. "Now I shall have no more peace," cried the old King, words which proved all too true. Newcastle, in order to insure the maintenance of his own power, took his brother's place as Prime Minister. Before many months a new war was to break out, destined to settle to a large degree problems "which had long been ripe for solution," problems "which concerned not only the British kingdom but all the civilized and almost all the inhabited world: whether France or England was to rule in India; whether the French manners, language and institutions or the English were to prevail over the immense continent of North America; whether Germany was to have a national existence; whether Spain was to monopolize the tropics; who was to command the ocean; who was to be dominant in the islands of the Spanish-American waters; what power was to possess the choice stands for business in the great markets of the globe." The Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle, which had settled so little in Europe, did still less toward defining the situation in India and America, for in the years following the inconclusive treaty, the ambitious activity of the French came to menace more and more dangerously, not only the security, but the very existence of the English in both these vast areas. The situation in India can best be made clear by a brief survey of its history.

The Beginnings of the English Activity in India. — Early in the sixteenth century the district now known as India, formerly under a number of independent rulers, was conquered and united by a line of emperors called by Europeans the Great Moguls. Rajahs or princes

became tributary, while other districts were formed under appointed viceroys. The Mogul's court at Delhi was a center of great magnificence. The decline of the dynasty, however, was rapid. The last great ruler died in 1707, and his successors degenerated into mere figureheads. Although the rajahs and viceroys continued nominally dependents, it was they who came to wield the real power. Meantime, the Europeans began to press in. First came the Portuguese, then the Dutch. Close on the heels of the latter came the English. The East India Company received its first charter from Elizabeth in 1600. At the beginning of the eighteenth century the Company had three separate and independent settlements, or "Presidencies," — at Madras, Calcutta, and Bombay. Already, the Portuguese and the Dutch had ceased to be formidable rivals; but a new competitor had arisen in the French. During the reign of Louis XIV they too founded an East India Company, establishing fortified settlements at Chandernagore near Calcutta, and at Pondicherry, about eighty miles southeast of Madras. In the Indian Ocean, off the Island of Madagascar, they acquired two fertile islands, one of which — the Isle de France, now Mauritius, — served as a naval base for India as Cape Breton did for Canada.

The French Strive for Supremacy in India. Dupleix and Clive. — In 1754, Dupleix, formerly Governor of Pondicherry, a remarkable man with a consuming ambition to establish a French empire in India, acquired supreme control of his country's affairs in the East. Having, with the aid of an able commander, made himself supreme in the southeastern and south central districts, known as the Carnatic and the Deccan, he seemed in a fair way to drive the British out of India when his victorious career was suddenly checked by a man to whom, more than any other, Great Britain owes the beginning of her present Indian Empire. This was Robert Clive (1725–1774) the son of an impoverished squire. Owing to his idle, wayward temper, his father, despairing of his chances of a career at home, procured for him a clerkship in the East India Company. Arriving almost penniless, he was frequently so depressed that he more than once attempted suicide. However, he soon secured a military commission, and began his fighting career, in 1751, in the Carnatic, where he early distinguished himself in a series of brilliant victories. The French Company, who cared more for dividends than for political dominion, finally gave way to the English in this district, and Dupleix, crushed with grief and disappointment, died in 1763.

The French and English in North America. — For some time, however, the interest of the English Government centered chiefly in North

America. There the boundary line between Canada and Nova Scotia had been left unsettled by the late peace, while, in addition, there was a large ill-defined territory between the headwaters of the Ohio River and the southern shore of Lake Erie claimed by both Great Britain and France. More serious still, the French determined to establish themselves in the disputed district and to secure the control of the Mississippi basin, with a view to uniting their settlements on the St. Lawrence with those on the coast of the Gulf of Mexico. To that end, the Marquis Duquesne, Governor of Canada, was instructed to undertake the construction of a chain of forts in the Ohio country. If the French succeeded in carrying out their policy, the English colonists would be confined to a narrow strip of territory between the Appalachians and the Atlantic, unable to expand westward, cut off from the profitable Indian trade beyond the barrier, and surrounded on three sides by their greatest rival and enemy. By way of protest, the Governor of Virginia sent George Washington, then a young surveyor who had been active in opening new trade routes to the Great Lakes, to demand that they withdraw from the valley of the Ohio country. He failed, of course. Moreover, in 1754, when the Virginians undertook to construct a fortress at the point where the Monongahela and Allegheny rivers unite to form the Ohio, the French drove them out, built a larger work on the same site which they named Fort Duquesne, and forced back across the Alleghanies a small body of Colonial militia which Washington led against them. These struggles to secure disputed territory brought on the war between Great Britain and France, which resulted in the latter's expulsion from the mainland of North America.

Braddock's Defeat (1755). — While, as yet, no formal declaration of war had been issued, the Commons, early in 1755, in response to a message from the King, voted supplies for an increase of the forces on land and sea. On 9 July, General Braddock, who had been sent from England to recover Fort Duquesne, was caught in ambush almost ten miles from his destination and mortally wounded. Seven hundred of his troops were shot down, while the rest sought safety in flight.

The Plight of Newcastle. — Poor Newcastle was perplexed and vacillating in the face of a crisis that would have taxed the capacity of a more spacious and decisive mind. It was necessary to defend the British Colonial possessions in America, to protect Hanover, and to secure and extend alliances with the Continental Powers. To make it all the harder for him there was strong opposition in the Ministry and the Commons to treaties which were negotiated with

various German States for the purpose of securing troops in return for subsidies. The distracted Premier in his despair turned to Pitt: he offered him a seat in the Cabinet, he dangled before him the most glowing prospects; he pleaded and even wept, but Pitt, who had no confidence in the man or his policy, firmly refused. Newcastle only succeeded in carrying the treaties with the aid of Henry Fox, an amiable but unscrupulous political adventurer, whom he was obliged to bribe with a Secretaryship of State and the leadership of the House of Commons.

The Loss of Minorca (June, 1756).—In the early months of 1756, the nation was trembling at the prospect of an invasion from France, but the French menace was intended merely to cover another design—the capture of Minorca. Yet it was not till 7 April, just three days before the French armament sailed from Toulon, that the English Ministers, deceived in the face of ample warning, finally dispatched a fleet to reënforce Minorca. The Commander, Admiral Byng, was the last person to choose for the work ahead of him: while personally brave he was overcautious, irresolute, inclined to magnify difficulties, and reluctant to assume responsibility. However, he engaged the enemy, 20 May, and though slightly worsted, he succeeded, thanks to the energetic attack of his rear admiral, in driving off the investing fleet. Nevertheless, he became very despondent and held a council of war in which he recommended withdrawal on the ground that his losses were great, that his ships were in bad condition, and that even a victory would not enable him to relieve the fortress besieged by the forces which the French had landed. The council agreed, and Minorca, left to its fate, surrendered in June. The news was received in England with a storm of grief and indignation. Though the Ministers were blamed for their delay, the chief resentment was directed against Byng. In the great towns he was burned in effigy, his country house was attacked by a mob, while Parliament and the Ministers were overwhelmed with petitions demanding vengeance. Newcastle, hoping to divert the popular wrath from himself, not only yielded to it but sought to excite it still more. Byng was recalled and confined at Greenwich.

The Declaration of War (1756). The Grouping of the Powers.—Meantime, England had declared war, 18 May; France replied, 9 June, and before long nearly all Europe was involved. The grouping of the Powers was different from that in the previous conflict; for Prussia now appeared as an ally of England, and Austria as an opponent. Austria, finding that England was disinclined to go to war to aid her in recovering Silesia, had turned to her old enemy France.

Louis XV in responding to her overtures was influenced by various considerations: for one thing, a combination of the Catholic against the Protestant Powers appealed to him in the light of a grand crusade, since he was as devout as he was debauched; moreover, he was personally embittered against Frederick, who had unguardedly referred to him more than once with great contempt and had openly scoffed at his all-powerful favorite, Madame de Pompadour. In consequence, a treaty was concluded, 1 May, 1756, between France and Austria, aiming at the partition of Prussia. Russia, Poland, Saxony, and Sweden joined the combination. Frederick, directly he suspected what was afoot, made advances to King George, with the result that an alliance was speedily arranged.

Frederick and the Third Silesian War (1756–1763). — Suddenly, in August, 1756, Frederick, who had the advantage of being well prepared, demanded from the Austrian Empress a statement of her intentions, with war as the alternative. When he received an evasive answer he poured his troops into Saxony. Thus began the third Silesian War which was coterminous with the Seven Years' War (1756–1763).[1] Frederick had many defeats as well as victories during the course of the struggle, and was so despondent at times that he contemplated suicide; but he fought on with rare constancy and ability, and his activity furnished an invaluable diversion to the English.

The Resignation of Newcastle. Pitt a Secretary of State. — The autumn of 1756 was marked by a revolution in the English Ministry. Fox, finding that Newcastle gave him no power or confidence and tried to thrust upon him responsibility for measures in which he had no share, resigned his Secretaryship in October. After trying once more to win over Pitt, and after a vain effort to find a Secretary sufficiently strong to support him in the House of Commons, Newcastle resigned very reluctantly. A new Cabinet was finally constructed, in which Pitt, who became a Secretary of State, was the real power. Among other things, his appointment is significant from the fact that he was the first English statesman forced into a Cabinet position by pressure of public opinion. Beyond his family connection with the Grenvilles[2] he had no organized following in the Commons and little parliamentary influence. Indeed, he was opposed to party connection and aimed to break the power of the Whig oligarchy, to call to the service of the State the best men irrespective

[1] Known in American history as the French and Indian War.

[2] In 1754 he had married Lady Hester Grenville, sister of Richard (Lord Temple) and George Grenville.

of their political affiliations and to bring the Crown into harmony with Parliament, which in its turn should be the true servant of the people. Abroad, he wanted to build up the British Empire, and — but only as a means to that end — to make Great Britain a dominant power in Europe.

Estimate of Pitt. — The man who now, at the close of his forty-eighth year, first had a chance to try his ability on a large scale had hitherto distinguished himself as a furious critic of the Administration, as an orator of fiery and irresistible eloquence, and as a man who refused to enrich himself at the public expense. He was fully conscious of his ability, but his ambition was for public service, not for private advancement. The people whom, as no other statesman of the time, he loved and understood made him their idol. Nevertheless, when he felt that they were wrong he never hesitated to cross their will. Yet in this lofty character there were many grave faults and inconsistencies. Under Walpole he clamored for war, while at the same time opposing the maintenance of a standing army; also he bitterly attacked the policy of subsidizing Hanover and other German States, though afterwards, in order to obtain office, he supported the very policy he had unsparingly condemned. To be sure, he had high motives for desiring office, he had a right to alter his opinion, and circumstances had changed; but it is a wonderful tribute to his magnetic influence that neither this change of front nor various other inconsistencies seriously affected his moral ascendancy. Moreover, he was vain, artificial, and always posing for effect, and so irritable and overbearing that it was almost impossible for anyone to work with him. But his temper can be excused from the fact that he was a lifelong sufferer from gout and from a nervous disease frequently so acute as to amount almost to insanity. Yet, after all has been said, he was tireless in his country's service, her greatest War Minister, one of the great builders of her Empire, a true friend of liberty, and a true patriot — in short a grand heroic figure whose character and achievements overshadow his blemishes.

Pitt's System. — Pitt at once took energetic measures for carrying on the war. Among them he proposed, regardless of the charge of inconsistency to which it exposed him, a grant for the defense of Hanover; and in this case he was justified, since the proposed subsidies were not for purely German objects, but as a measure of defense against the French who were making ready to attack the Electorate. Pitt's great combination of military and naval strategy — known as his "system" — which he now began to develop, was for a long time misunderstood, largely owing to a remark which he once made, that

he would "conquer America in Germany." As a matter of fact, his main energies were devoted to beating the French in America and to securing command of the seas in order to prevent them from sending reënforcements and supplies to their colonial forces. His Continental operations were designed to keep the enemy occupied and to prevent them from gaining such successes as would counterbalance English achievements in the central theater of the war. While he contented himself with sending abroad subsidies and occasional contingents, France, by virtue of her position, was obliged to divide her energies between the European war and the colonial and maritime struggle with Great Britain.

The Execution of Byng (14 March, 1757). — Byng was tried by court martial. The court, while acquitting him of treachery or cowardice, rendered an opinion that he had not done his utmost to raise the siege or to defeat the French fleet. According to the Articles of War they were obliged to impose the death penalty for neglect of duty, though they unanimously recommended the Admiral to the royal mercy. The public, however, demanded a victim for the loss of Minorca; threatening letters were sent to George, and glaring posters appeared with the jingle: "Hang Byng or take care of your King." Pitt strove manfully against the tide, but he had no parliamentary support and had not yet won the royal favor. So the public had its way. Byng, meeting his fate with manly courage, was shot, 14 March, 1757.

The Dismissal and Recall of Pitt. — The King, who had not yet overcome his aversion to Pitt, was determined to get rid of him "at any cost." The die was cast when the Duke of Cumberland refused to take command of the Electoral army, if Pitt continued as Secretary. As a result the latter was dismissed in April. For nearly three months the distracted country, with a tremendous war on its hands, remained without a Government. At length, the King, much to his disgust, was forced to yield to public opinion and consent to an arrangement by which Pitt came back as Secretary with the whole charge of foreign affairs, while Newcastle became Prime Minister, devoting himself to the congenial task of managing Parliament.

The Campaign of 1757. — Pitt, forced to "borrow the majority of the Duke of Newcastle," was to achieve glorious things; but on his advent to office in June, 1757, the prospect seemed gloomy enough. Everything was in confusion, the debt was piling up, the country was in constant fear of invasion, and the loss of Minorca threatened her supremacy in the Mediterranean and her commerce in the Levant. Moreover, the military events of the year were almost uniformly unsuccessful. In America nothing was accomplished, a joint land and

naval expedition sent by Pitt against the coast of France proved a costly and fruitless failure, while the Duke of Cumberland, in attempting to defend the Electorate against a superior force of French invaders, met with a reverse that marked the end of his active military career. Frederick, already hard pressed by the Austrians and threatened by the Russians, now had to face in addition two French armies released from the west by the recent capitulation. Nevertheless, he managed to defeat the French at Rossbach in Saxony, 5 November, and then, with amazing energy and ability, to advance into Silesia and to win an overwhelming victory over the Austrians at Leuthen, 5 December, thus bringing to a triumphant close a long and desperate campaign.

The Campaign of 1758. Operations in North America and Africa. — In 1758 the effect of Pitt's system first began to bear fruit. He devised elaborate plans to carry on the war on four continents, in America, Africa, India and Europe. His chief energies were devoted to America. Three forces were prepared. The main attack was directed against Louisburg which, together with the whole island, was captured before the end of July. Most conspicuous for bravery and energy was General Wolfe, the second in command, whose appointment marked one of Pitt's most daring innovations, splendidly justified by its results — election for important posts on the basis of merit rather than seniority or influence. A second force, ordered to secure the French forts commanding Lake George and Lake Champlain in order to open the way for an attack on Canada, failed to achieve its purpose. A third army, sent out from Philadelphia, succeeded in capturing Fort Duquesne, thus securing the "key of the great West." The next year, Fort Pitt was erected, a name which survives to-day in the great manufacturing city of Pittsburgh. An expedition against the French possessions on the west coast of Africa secured possession of the river Senegal and the Island of Goree.

The War in Europe (1758). — Fleets were fitted out to seal up the French ports and to guard the Channel. During the summer, two expeditions were sent against the coast of France, which, though they inflicted little actual damage on the enemy, effected their purpose of diverting the French from sending reënforcements to Germany. Frederick's victories had been received with joy in England, where he was hailed as the "Protestant hero." Parliament voted him a subsidy and agreed to support an army of 35,000 in western Germany, where the new commander, Prince Ferdinand of Brunswick, during the year fought the French on the whole with success; though the poor Hanoverians suffered pitifully from the fighting as well as the marching and countermarching through their territory. Farther east,

Frederick managed to beat back an invasion of the Russians who got within a few days' march of Berlin; but he was severely handled by the Austrians in Saxony, though they failed to profit by a victory, 14 October, in which they nearly annihilated his army. Even Pitt was appalled by the increasing cost of the war, but the people loyally supported him, while Newcastle, though with a sour grace, used his influence in Parliament to secure the necessary grants. The generous outlays were rewarded the coming year by a series of victories rarely paralleled in history.

The Plan of Campaign against Quebec (1759). — In spite of elaborate preparations for home defense against a threatened French invasion, Pitt went on with his plans for the conquest of North America. A fleet was dispatched to the West Indies, which captured Guadeloupe, 1 May; but Canada was the main object of the campaign. Three expeditions starting from different points were directed to converge on Quebec, the stronghold of the Province. One from the west, forming the left wing and consisting of Colonial forces and friendly Indians, was to reduce Niagara, sail across Lake Ontario, and pass down the St. Lawrence by way of Montreal. The army of the center was to start from New York, strike again at Ticonderoga, secure Lake Champlain, and push on into the St. Lawrence. The eastern or right wing, composed of an army under General Wolfe and a fleet under Admiral Saunders, was to sail up to Quebec from the mouth of the St. Lawrence. Since neither of the two other expeditions — though they gained some not unimportant successes and diverted a number of French troops — ever reached their objective, the whole task of reducing Quebec rested upon Wolfe and Saunders. Fortunately for Great Britain, the French administration was corrupt and divided, and the country was too exhausted by the Continental war to send adequate forces to the relief of Canada. Montcalm, on the news of the impending attack, concentrated the whole French defense in and about Quebec, which, from its situation on a steep bluff commanding the St. Lawrence, was one of the strong places of the world. While the French and Canadians had the advantage of position, and outnumbered[1] the British as well, the latter were better drilled and organized, and were backed by a powerful fleet. Between one and two thousand of the defenders were gathered in the city, the remainder, nearly fourteen thousand, were stationed along the steep and strongly fortified left bank of the river below the town.

The Capture of Quebec (September, 1759). — From July to September they successfully withstood all attempts of the British to over-

[1] Wolfe started with an army of about 8000.

come them from this side. At length, on the advice of his subalterns, Wolfe decided to move his forces past Quebec and attack from the other side. For thirty miles the river bank was sheer and rocky with only an occasional break. Montcalm, who expected that the attempted landing would be made some miles up the river, had disposed his chief forces accordingly, but Wolfe had discovered a place, only a mile and a half along the bank, which led to the Plains of Abraham, a plateau overlooking the city. In the early morning of 13 September, 1759, he crossed from the southern shore with four thousand men, made his way up the almost impassable ascent by a path so narrow that in places two could not walk abreast, and gained possession of the bluff, which was guarded by a garrison of only two hundred men who fled and left the invaders in possession. Montcalm, when, from his camp below the city, he heard the sound of muskets, hurriedly mounted his horse, rode toward the scene of action and hastily summoned his forces; but, unable to contend against the superior discipline of their adversaries, they wavered, broke, and fled within the walls of Quebec. In this conflict on the Plains of Abraham, which decided the fate of New France, both commanders were mortally wounded. The garrison yielded, 18 September. However, the French troops outside, who fled to Montreal, were able to hold out for another year. The news of the fall of the stronghold which the British had begun to believe impregnable was received with wild exultation, but it was mingled with mourning for the loss of the man who had brought the conquest of Canada within sight.

The French Invasion Frustrated. — Meantime, Admiral Rodney had bombarded Havre and destroyed many of the flat-bottomed boats destined to transport French troops to England; in August another English fleet seriously incapacitated a squadron which put out from Toulon; and 20 November, at Quiberon, Admiral Hawke overcame the Brest fleet — an achievement which was a marvel of daring and skill. Heedless of the rocks and shoals of an unfamiliar coast and in the teeth of a heavy storm and a high sea, he boldly pursued the enemy toward the shore and with the loss of only two ships he took or sunk five of the French and scattered the rest. The result of these successes was to make the British again supreme at sea, and to put an end to the French prospect of a general invasion.

The War in Germany (1759). — All the while, Frederick was struggling for existence against the Austrians and Russians who were pressing in upon the Saxon and Silesian frontier. In spite of defeat and despondency he held his ground, leaving Ferdinand of Brunswick free to deal with two French armies in western Germany. The latter, after

some preliminary reverses, gained a decisive victory over the combined forces of the enemy at Minden, 1 August. The entire destruction of the French was only prevented by the refusal of Lord George Sackville to charge the broken columns with his cavalry, which had been held in reserve during the earlier part of the fight.

The "Great Year" of Victories (1759). — All together, the year was unique in the annals of British military achievement. In America, in Africa, in India, in Europe, by land and sea, wherever her forces had been engaged, they had been signally victorious. Almost every month had brought news of a fresh triumph. Fortunately, too, British trade and manufactures grew and flourished, thus enabling the country to bear the enormous burden of the war. Pitt, who by his genius and his industry had planned the campaign, equipped the expeditions, and selected the commanders, had breathed into the nation his own heroic spirit. At length England, as Frederick the Great joyfully testified, "had borne a man." Even the King had been completely won over, while the Commons loyally voted him all that he demanded.

India (1756–1760). **The "Black Hole" of Calcutta** (20 June, 1756). — Meantime, an empire was being won in India. The conquest began in Bengal where a powerful line of princes ruled independently of the Moguls in everything but name. In April, 1756, Suraja Dowlah succeeded to this great inheritance. He was only nineteen, feeble in intellect but ferocious in temper and consumed with hatred for the Europeans. When the Presidency of Calcutta began to erect new fortifications against the French he led forth a vast army and took possession of Fort William, 20 June. That very night, in spite of his promise that the lives of the prisoners should be spared, 145 men and one woman were, by the command of his officers, thrust into the common dungeon of the fort, known to the English as the "Black Hole" of Calcutta. It was only eighteen feet by fourteen, with two small windows overhung by a low veranda. After a night of indescribable suffering, witnessed by the guards with "fiendish glee," 23 of the 146 were found alive in the morning. The news which reached Madras, 16 August, found the English in the midst of a struggle with the French for the control of the Carnatic. After a quarrel as to who should command, Clive, with a force of Europeans and Sepoys,[1] was dispatched north in a British fleet. The native garrison at Calcutta was easily put to flight and the settlement abandoned to the English, 2 January, 1757. Convinced that there could be "neither peace nor trade" until Suraja Dowlah — on whom no dependence could be placed — was disposed of, Clive marched from Calcutta with 3000 men, of whom

[1] Native troops in European service.

only a third were English. On the morning of 23 June, 1757, he engaged the enemy at the village of Plassey, and before nightfall had put to flight their force of 35,000 infantry and 15,000 cavalry, together with forty cannon under the direction of Frenchmen in the native service. With a loss of 22 slain and 50 wounded, Clive had won Bengal and laid the foundations of the British Empire in India. Suraja Dowlah, who had escaped during the battle, was later caught and executed. The directors of the East India Company made Clive Governor of Bengal, in which capacity he showed the same astonishing ability that he had shown as a conqueror. While he made a fortune for himself, and while vanity and instances of bad faith may be charged against him, he was subjected to unusual temptations, and Chatham, mindful of his achievements, hailed him as a "heaven-born general."

Winning of the Carnatic (1759–1761).—Meanwhile, the struggle between the British and the French had continued in the southeast; but the French commander alienated the natives by trampling on their caste distinctions, he was hampered by lack of funds, and grew steadily unpopular even with his own people. The arrival of a British fleet forced him to raise the siege of Madras, and Colonel Eyre Coote, who brought reënforcements of troops, by a series of successes established British ascendancy in the Carnatic before the end of 1759. One place after another yielded to their arms, and with the fall of Pondicherry in January, 1761, the French lost their last stronghold in India. In spite of restorations of territory, made in 1763, they were never able to recover their lost ground, and their East India Company soon became extinct. The future struggles of the British were with the natives and not with the rival European powers.

The Completion of the Conquest of Canada (1760). — With the approach of spring, in 1760, the condition of Quebec became critical; nevertheless, the English commander was able to hold off a French attacking force until an English fleet came to his relief, whereupon the French commander withdrew and shut himself up in Montreal. Three British armies were sent against him — one from Quebec, another from Crown Point, and the third under General Amherst from Oswego. Amherst, who acted as commander-in-chief, managed to concentrate these various forces so brilliantly and effectively that Montreal, surrounded without hope of relief, was forced to capitulate, 8 September, 1760, and the British conquest of Canada was finally complete.

The Turn in the Tide of Frederick's Fortunes (1760). — While his ally was winning empires in America and India, Frederick was trying to recover from his reverses and to hold his own against the Austrians and the Russians. Although he defeated one Austrian army, 15 August,

1760, thereby securing Silesia, he was unable to prevent another force from joining with the Russians and marching on Berlin, which they occupied for three days. Having relieved his capital, Frederick marched into Saxony, which the Austrians had again entered, drove them out after a victory at Torgau, 3 November, the last and bloodiest battle of the Third Silesian War, and closed the campaign with the feeling that the tide in his fortunes had turned. Ferdinand, though with some difficulty, held the southern and western frontier against two French armies which together amounted to 200,000 men.

The Death of George II (25 October, 1760). — In the midst of the triumph of English arms, George II died, 25 October, 1760. In spite of his faults, he could boast that during a reign of thirty-three years he had not, in a single instance, violated the Constitution. To whatever cause his moderation may have been due, the result was happy for England. Curiously enough, Pitt, the man who had begun by earning his hatred, crowned his reign with glorious achievement. Though George gave his confidence grudgingly, he gave it unreservedly, and, from 1757 until the end of the King's life, the policy of the country was practically Pitt's policy. With the accession of George's grandson a momentous change was to come.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

Narrative and Constitutional. Leadam; Robertson; Bright; Stanhope; Lecky; *Cambridge Modern History;* Hallam; and Taylor.

Biography. Coxe's and Morley's *Walpole.* Hon. Evan Charteris, *William Augustus, Duke of Cumberland, 1721–1748* (1913), a brilliant scholarly apology. Lord Rosebery, *Lord Chatham, His Early Life and Connections* (1910), to 1756, scholarly and charmingly written. F. Harrison, *William Pitt, Earl of Chatham* (1905), a brief sketch. Macaulay, *Critical and Historical Essays* (3d ed., 1853), two famous essays on Pitt. The two great biographies of Pitt are A. von Ruville, *William Pitt, Earl of Chatham* (3 vols., 1907, Eng. tr.) and Basil Williams, *The Life of William Pitt* (2 vols. 1913), the former hostile, the latter favorable. Kate Hotblack, *Chatham's Colonial Policy* (1917), a valuable contribution. T. W. Riker, *Henry Fox, First Lord Holland* (2 vols., 1911). P. C. Yorke, *The Life and Correspondence of Philip Yorke, Earl of Hardwicke* (3 vols., 1913).

Army and Navy. Fortescue, *British Army;* Mahan, *Sea Power;* J. S. Corbett, *England in the Seven Years' War* (2 vols., 1907); Clowes, *Royal Navy.*

America. *Cambridge Modern History,* VII, chs. I–IV (bibliography, 753–779), India, *ibid.,* VI, ch. XV (bibliography, 925–932). For further bibliography on America and India, Robertson, 523, and Leadam, 515.

Pitman, F. W., *The Development of the British West Indies* (1917). C. M. Andrews, *The Colonial Period* (1912), an excellent brief survey.

Contemporary. John, Lord Hervey, *Memoirs of the Reign of George II to the Death of Queen Caroline* (ed. J. W. Croker, 2 vols., 1848), ill-natured and to be read with caution. Horace Walpole, *Memoirs of the Reign of George II* (ed. Lord Holland, 3 vols., 1846).

Selections from the sources. Adams and Stephens, no. 249, and Robertson, pt. I, nos. XXIX–XLIII.

CHAPTER XLII

THE REVIVAL OF THE ROYAL ASCENDANCY. THE FIRST YEARS OF GEORGE III (1760–1770)

The Significance of the Reign of George III. — The accession of George III, 25 October, 1760, marked a notable attempt to revive the personal power of the Sovereign and a consequent setback to the progress of Cabinet and party government for over twenty years. While his two predecessors had seen the wisdom of leaving the Government largely in the hands of their Whig Ministers, George III bent all his energies to break the power of the dominant oligarchy and systematically to impose his will upon the nation. Another result of his accession was the return to power of the Tories, after nearly fifty years of exclusion from office. Events had been working in their favor for some years before George III ascended the throne. Although the Whigs monopolized office and power and controlled Parliament, they were at odds among themselves, for the party was split into various factions, each dominated by one of the great families; moreover, Pitt, while he was nominally a Whig bound by a working agreement with Newcastle, hated all party combinations. His views and example did something to discredit the old system, though his methods and aims were quite the opposite of those of the new King. Pitt's idea was to call in the best men of both parties, who were backed by the people and voiced popular opinion; George's was to put in office only those who would serve his purpose in establishing the royal ascendancy. Aside from the disintegration of the Whigs, other causes rendered the situation most favorable for the revival of a strong monarchy. The Stuart rivals of the Hanoverian line had been hopelessly discredited by the failure of 1745. Furthermore, though George III had no share in them, the victories of Pitt had aroused a tremendous loyalty and national enthusiasm that was bound to reflect luster on the Crown. Finally, while the first two Georges were full of Hanoverian prejudices and were distrusted in consequence, their successor was born in England and inspired in his subjects the confidence that he was a typical Englishman.

George III, his Personal Traits. — George III was now twenty-two years old. Owing to the quarrels of his father, Prince Frederick,[1] with the late King, the boy's early years were passed apart from the royal court, so that he grew up "full of prejudices . . . fostered by women and pages." Utterly ignorant of business when he became King, he shook off his slothful habits and applied himself zealously to his duties. His favorite occupation was agriculture, which gained for him the popular title of "Farmer George." Perhaps his most admirable quality was his unquestioned bravery. This, together with his simplicity, his purity of family life, and his piety, endeared him to the middle-class Englishman. Conscientious he was, too, and right in his intentions; but overestimating his own wisdom and rectitude, he could appreciate no point of view but his own, and treated with rudeness, vindictiveness, and even treachery, all those who presumed to differ from him.

His Policy. — Patriotic and high-minded statesmen who were assertive and independent were kept out of office, while those who did his bidding, however incompetent or dissolute, were loaded with royal confidence and favor. Economically as he managed his household, he spent such vast sums in the bestowal of bribes and pensions that he was always in debt. His money, together with the patronage and the boroughs which he controlled, was lavishly employed in maintaining a strong body of supporters in Parliament, known as the "King's friends," though they were not admitted to the circle of his personal intimates, who were all kindly, honest folk. Something, however, must be said for George by way of extenuation. His mother, Augusta of Saxe-Gotha, who had much to do with forming his mind, ceaselessly drilled him in the traditions of a petty German court, and exhorted him to "be a King." Her closest and most trusted adviser, John, Earl of Bute, reënforced her teachings. Bute was a Scotsman, with polished manners and a talent for intrigue; but of slender ability, pompous, haughty, and a magnifier of royalty. Under their guidance, George, in order to restore the influence of the Crown, used the Tories as a body of servile henchmen, instead of building up the party on a strong wholesome footing as a counterpoise to the corrupt Whig oligarchy; instead of reforming the representative system and the public service, he increased parliamentary and official corruption; he swelled the National Debt, made serious encroachments on the liberty of the subjects, and lost to England the richest and most flourishing of her colonies. In the final estimate, some allowance must be made for the fact that twice in the first half of his reign he was attacked by

[1] He died in 1751.

fits of insanity, and spent the last ten years of his life in complete mental darkness.

The Opening of the Reign (1760). — George's first aim was to break up the coalition between Pitt and Newcastle, to put an end to the war with France and to place his favorite Bute at the head of affairs. The Cabinet was torn with dissensions, and Pitt was so high-handed that he had not a single stanch supporter in the whole body. On the other hand, he was still the popular idol, while Bute was hated, partly as a Scotsman and more particularly because of the suspicion that the Princess Dowager was too much under his influence. Indeed, it was a favorite practice for the City mob, at almost every demonstration during the next few years, to hang a petticoat or a bonnet, together with a jack boot, on a pole. The King himself, however, was received at first with an enthusiasm unequaled since the Restoration.

The Resignation of Pitt (5 October, 1761). — There were various indications that George's efforts to bring about a peace would soon prevail. In March, 1761, Bute became Pitt's colleague as Secretary of State, and other Tories were brought into office. What with subsidies and the steadily increasing military establishment, the debt was piling up alarmingly; increasing difficulty was experienced in filling the ranks, and riots were of frequent occurrence. Peace negotiations had been opened, but Pitt was bent on utterly destroying the power of France. His opponents argued in reply that such a result would inevitably bring about a great European coalition against England in the interest of balance of power, and that to take Canada from France would remove an effective means of retaining a hold on the North American colonies. The French, who, nevertheless, might have been forced to accept Pitt's hard terms, were encouraged to resist when Spain ranged herself on her side and presented a series of demands to the English through the French negotiators. Pitt scornfully refused to consider any claims brought before him in such a manner, and before long broke off negotiations with the French as well. Suspecting that the two Monarchies were in secret alliance, and that Spain was on the point of joining in the conflict, he made ready to strike at her exposed places, while, in a Cabinet Council, held 2 October, he proposed an immediate declaration of war against Spain before she could complete her preparations. Events proved that he had interpreted the situation correctly; for, 15 August, Charles III and Louis XV had signed a new Family Compact uniting their countries in an offensive and defensive alliance. Only one of his colleagues agreed with Pitt; so, after a series of stormy discussions, he resigned, 5 October.

The End of the Newcastle Ministry (1762). — Thus the King and his party succeeded in overthrowing the great War Minister in the full course of his victorious career. Soon after, Spain, having completed her arrangements, openly proclaimed her alliance with France, and Great Britain was forced to reply by a declaration of war, 2 January, 1762. Thanks to Pitt's preparations, a series of new and striking successes followed. On 14 August, Havana yielded after a siege of little more than two months, and the capture of Manila followed in October. Newcastle, who had rejoiced at the fall of Pitt in the hope that he might recover his lost ascendancy, had been speedily disillusioned. The King and his followers treated him with studied rudeness and neglect. When they ceased even to consult him in questions of patronage, the veteran old place-monger resigned, May, 1762, seizing as a pretext Bute's refusal to continue the Prussian subsidy. The King's favorite, who for months had been virtually Prime Minister, now openly assumed the position.

The Bute Ministry (1762–1763), and the Peace of Paris. — By a lavish use of bribery and intimidation the Treaty of Paris was carried, in the teeth of a stout opposition by the Tories, after Pitt and the Whigs had led the country to victory. At home and abroad, the dominant party was accused of deserting the country's German allies. Bute, however, protested that Prussia was guaranteed from danger before British subsidies and troops were withdrawn from Germany, but Frederick, who also believed that the new Prime Minister intrigued with Austria behind his back, was so infuriated that he became hopelessly alienated. The loss of his support was seriously felt in the crises of years to come.

The Terms of Peace. — By the definitive peace, signed at Paris, 10 February, 1763, France withdrew her troops from Germany; she restored Minorca; and ceded Canada, Nova Scotia, Cape Breton, and all the islands in the river and Gulf of St. Lawrence, together with such territories as she claimed east of the Mississippi, except New Orleans. She also gave up several of the West Indian islands, as well as her African possessions on the Senegal. Great Britain, on her part, restored various conquests, she granted the French certain fishing rights in the St. Lawrence and off the banks of Newfoundland, ceding two islands, on condition that they should never be fortified, and agreed that the navigation of the Mississippi should be free to both countries. She also ceded Martinique and other West Indian islands. In India there was a mutual restoration of conquests made since 1749, though the French were forbidden to have troops or fortifications in Bengal and forced to agree to acknowledge the native

princes, in the Carnatic and the Deccan, whom the British chose to support. Spain ceded to Great Britain Florida, together with all her other possessions east of the Mississippi, in return for which France compensated her with Louisiana and New Orleans, while England restored Havana, but reserved the right to cut logwood in the Bay of Honduras. Manila and the Philippines were handed back, since the news of the conquest did not arrive until after the signature of the preliminaries.

The Opposition to the Peace and the Resignation of Bute (1763). — These terms were substantially what Pitt had rejected in 1761, so that England profited nothing by another year of victories. She had made tremendous gains; but she had ceded, without adequate compensation, territories actually held at the end of the war. This roused a storm of protest throughout England; Bute was hissed and pelted as he went to and from Parliament, and had to employ a bodyguard of bruisers and butchers to protect him. Numerous abusive libels appeared, some, it is said, instigated by the agents of Frederick the Great. Realizing that his unpopularity was injuring the cause of his royal master, Bute resigned, 7 April, 1763. He had accomplished the King's two main purposes of putting an end to the war and breaking up the Whig connection, but he left the country seething with discontent and deprived of its only powerful ally.

The Grenville Ministry (1763–1765), and John Wilkes. — Bute was succeeded by George Grenville (1712–1770), who also took the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer. He was upright, industrious, skillful in finance and well versed in parliamentary procedure; but he was narrow-minded, utterly lacking in tact and breadth of political outlook. No sooner had the new Minister come into office than he became involved in a momentous quarrel with John Wilkes, a profane and profligate man of fashion, who, because of his wit, his audacity, and his skill in meeting the ill-advised attempts of the Government to suppress him, became the darling of the populace. By the agitation which he stirred up, at least two important principles in the progress of the liberty of the subject were established: that general warrants[1] were illegal and that the House of Commons may not permanently exclude any member, not legally disqualified, whom the constituents may choose to elect.

The *North Briton Review*, No. 45, and Its Consequences (1763–1764). — Wilkes had been chiefly instrumental in founding, June, 1762, the *North Briton Review*, a journal devoted to attacking the

[1] That is, warrants which do not specify the persons to be arrested for a particular offense.

Government. In the famous "No. 45," which appeared 23 April, 1763, a speech from the Throne[1] defending the recent peace was vigorously assailed, together with the whole policy of the past few months. While the personal character of the King was referred to with respect, his favorite was lashed unmercifully. George III, however, was infuriated at the assertion that he was only the "first magistrate of this country . . . responsible to his people for due exercise of the royal function in the choice of his Ministers," and he determined to crush the man who sought to reduce him to a mere figurehead and who presumed to assail those whom he had selected to do his will. Accordingly, a general warrant was issued, directing the arrest of the "authors, printers, and publishers" of the offensive number, as well as the seizure of their papers. Wilkes was apprehended on the word of the publishers and lodged in the Tower. Protesting on two grounds — that general warrants were illegal, and that, as a member of Parliament, he was entitled to the privilege of freedom from arrest on civil process — he succeeded in bringing the case before the Court of Common Pleas, where the Chief Justice decided in favor of his parliamentary privilege.[2]

The End of the First Stage of the Proceedings against Wilkes (1764). — Wilkes was not only released but was awarded damages. When he had the temerity to celebrate his triumph by printing an annotated edition of "No. 45," the Government undertook measures of systematic vindictiveness: spies were set upon his track; his letters were opened at the Post Office, and the Attorney-General brought suit for libel against him in legal form. Parliament met 15 November, 1763, and though the case was still pending, the Commons proceeded to vote No. 45, "a false, scandalous and seditious libel," and to order it to be burnt by the common hangman. In the Upper House, Lord Sandwich, one of Wilkes' boon companions, suddenly produced an obscene parody of Pope's *Essay on Man*, entitled an *Essay on Woman*, and a blasphemous version of the *Veni Creator*, which the Peers at once voted to be "scandalous, obscene, and impious libels." Undoubtedly they were; but Wilkes had intended them only for private circulation and the motives of his opponents were only too apparent. The popular excitement became intense.

[1] For some time it had been the practice for the chief Ministers to prepare the speech from the throne, and as a matter of fact Bute had been the author of the one in question.

[2] In certain other suits which came up he pronounced the momentous opinion that general warrants were illegal. They had hitherto been held to be legal, though regarded as contrary to the spirit of the Constitution and subversive to the liberty of the subject.

The London mob defeated an attempt to burn No. 45, substituting a jack boot and a petticoat in its place. Wilkes was hailed as the champion of popular liberty, and his portrait became a favorite sign for taverns. On the other hand, the Court influence was so strong that Wilkes, in danger of his life, fled to France. In his absence he was expelled from the Commons, 19 January, 1764, and, 21 February, the Court of King's Bench passed sentence against him for reprinting No. 45 and for writing the *Essay on Woman*. On his failure to appear he was outlawed. Four years later he was destined to return and raise a new issue.

The Beginning of the Breach with the Colonies. The Causes of the Revolution. — No sooner was Wilkes temporarily out of the way than Grenville, supported by George III, adopted measures relating to the American Colonies which resulted in a series of explosions that led to the Revolutionary War and the consequent dismemberment of the British Empire. In order to understand the causes for this crisis, at least two great and difficult questions have to be answered. First, what was the situation, political, social and economic, in the Colonies? and what was their attitude toward Great Britain when the attempt was made to impose the new policy upon them? Secondly, what measures really called forth the resistance and what measures or causes merely contributed?

The Institutional Divergence between the American Colonies and Great Britain. — The answer to the first question must be sought in the institutional development of the two countries from the first planting of the Colonies in America. This will show that two separate branches, two types of people, had grown from one parent stock, that the folk dwelling in England in the eighteenth century and those settled across the Atlantic were two offspring of the England of the seventeenth century. Those who migrated carried with them the tradition of the opposition to absolute Monarchy and an established Episcopal Church, New England, particularly, coming to represent the "dissidence of Dissent." Those who remained at home turned their backs on the extreme results of the Puritan Revolution, and even restored, in a modified form, both Monarchy and Episcopacy. Moreover, growth in a different environment tended to accentuate divergence in form and spirit of government, and the Americans had progressed to far greater lengths in the direction of democracy and equality.

Differences in the Theory and Practice of Representation. — Not only was the right to vote much easier to acquire in the Colonies, but even more striking was the difference in the distribution of repre-

sentatives and in the theory of representation. In the Colonies it was the general practice for a member of the assembly to represent his town or district, and bribery at elections was practically unknown; in England corruption prevailed to an alarming extent and the greatest inequalities existed. Rotten boroughs with scarcely an inhabitant returned two members each, while many flourishing towns sent none. The British theory was that everyone was virtually represented in Parliament. The essential thing was to have an elective body between the King and the people, and it was contended that a Cornishman was just as truly a representative of Lancashire as if he had been returned from that county. The Colonists, who were used to a different system, refused to accept this theory of virtual representation. Furthermore, they were in a different situation. In England public opinion, voiced in petitions and public meetings, counted for something even in the unrepresented districts, while a handful of Colonists three thousand miles across the sea could do little to affect the course of British legislation.

Training and Preparation for Independence. — Thus the Englishmen in the New World were steadily growing apart from the Englishmen in the Old. Moreover, the Colonists had received a long and effective training in self-government in their town meetings, in their county administration and in their provincial assemblies. Also, hard conditions of life in an undeveloped country had generated courage, resourcefulness, and independence of restraint. Their preachers, saturated with the revolutionary doctrines of Milton, Locke, and other advanced thinkers of the seventeenth century, preached and taught views quite at variance with the views of the men in power under George III. Then, although up to this time there had been no common grievance to call forth united resistance, there had been constant friction and bickerings between the Colonial assemblies and the Crown officials, men who were all too frequently either incompetent or unscrupulous.

The Commercial System. — Along with these differences in political theory and practice, the British commercial system was an equally — perhaps a more — important factor in preparing the way for the final break. As in the case of the other European Powers of the period, the British policy for the regulation of Colonial trade was mainly one of selfish and jealous exclusiveness. The aim of her Navigation Acts was to confine the carrying trade of "English" [1] lands to ships built within the British Empire, owned by the people thereof and navigated by officers and crews who were subjects of the English

[1] This term included the Colonies.

King. Certain Colonial products, such as tobacco and sugar, known as "enumerated goods," had to be laid on the shore of England or pay an export duty from the province where they were produced. Furthermore, with few exceptions, European goods destined for the Colonies must pass through England, the prime object being to give to English merchants the profit of handling the wares.[1] In 1733 the famous "Molasses Act" was passed, imposing heavy duties on rum, molasses, and sugar imported from the French, Dutch and Spanish West Indies into English Colonies on the American continent. This Act, had it been enforced, would have completely stifled a very profitable three-cornered trade by which the New Englanders shipped lumber and fish to the foreign West Indies, exchanged them for rum and sugar and molasses, and with West Indian rum — or with New England rum made from West Indian molasses — bought slaves on the coast of Africa which they sold to the planters. Restrictive as were all these regulations, they were to some degree counterbalanced in various ways. Colonial industry, especially shipbuilding, was promoted by the share the Colonists enjoyed in the carrying trade of the Empire. Then there were drawbacks of duties on goods reëxported from England; there were bounties to encourage the production of certain commodities, and special privileges and exceptions were allowed. For example, Colonial tobacco had enjoyed a monopoly in England and rice could be shipped south of Cape Finisterre directly from the Colonies.[2] Owing to the lax administration prevailing before the advent of Grenville, they manufactured what they liked, sent ships where they pleased, and purchased European wares more cheaply than Englishmen themselves. The theory of trade regulation was not questioned, because it was, at least so far as New England was concerned, rarely enforced in practice; but it was a potential grievance. The Colonies had become economically self-sufficing and were in a position to resist when the restrictions on their trade became a reality.

The Seven Years' War as a Factor in Provoking the Crisis. — At the moment when the constitutional and economic development of the Colonies was reaching its maturity, the Seven Years' War came to precipitate the crisis. It gave the Colonies a sense of unity resulting from achievement in a common undertaking, it stimulated a martial spirit, and, by transferring Canada from France to Great Britain, it removed a serious menace to the safety of the Colonies, and thereby one of the most powerful bonds which might

[1] These provisions may be found in the acts of 1660, 1663, 1672, and 1696.

[2] Also they had the advantage of the English naval protection.

have held them to the Home Country.[1] Moreover, the war furnished the occasion for the new British policy which gave the impulse to revolt. The Grenville program comprehended three measures: the enforcement of the Trade and Navigation Acts, a Stamp Act, and a Quartering Act. There was justification for them all. Not only had the Colonists openly and systematically evaded the acts regulating commerce, but they had actually supplied the enemy with goods during the recent conflict. Furthermore, a formidable rising of the Indians, in 1763, known as the Conspiracy of Pontiac, had shown that the Colonies were in real danger. The English Ministry felt that the Home Government, laden as it now was with a debt of £140,000,000, should not bear the whole burden of the defense of the Empire, and intended to employ the money to be raised by the stamp tax solely for Colonial purposes. On their part, however, the several Colonies had made considerable contributions toward the French and Indian War, for which most of them were still in debt. Now it was proposed to curtail one of their chief means of livelihood and at the same time to subject them to taxation over which they had no control, while in addition, the Act for quartering troops in their midst threatened to reduce them to complete dependence. Naturally they were bound to resist.

The Question of Parliamentary Supremacy over the Colonies. The question of the legal right of the British Parliament to tax the Colonies was hotly debated, and provoked sharp differences of opinion both in America and in England. Franklin drew a distinction between internal taxes and import duties; but leading patriots almost from the start refused to accept it, and it was soon discarded. Pitt's distinction between import duties for purposes of revenue and for regulation of trade was one that had historical justification; but it was impracticable. Moreover, the shackling of the trade was fully as unjust and involved fully as much hardship as the imposition of revenue duties. The theory later advocated by Edmund Burke was the most reasonable; that, while Parliament had the right to tax, it was inexpedient to exercise it. The Colonies, however, not only denied the right of Parliament to tax them but even called in question the legislative supremacy of that body, asserting that they were the peculiar subjects of the King.[2] Here was another instance

[1] This result had been predicted by many far-seeing thinkers. Canada would have been just as dangerous in the hands of the French, except that after it became a British possession there was a chance of winning the Canadians over to the Colonial side.

[2] It was only later that they discovered that it was George III who was responsible for most of the measures which they resented.

of the institutional divergence which had developed between the two branches of the English race. England had no written rigid Constitution; there the Constitution was the whole body of law and custom which had accumulated through the ages: the Puritan Revolution had decided that Parliament was practically omnipotent, and since 1707 the King had never ventured to veto a bill. On the other hand, the Colonies all had some form of written Constitution supreme over legislative enactment — a charter, a proprietary grant, or governor's instructions — and the veto was a reality. While they strove to extend the powers of their assemblies they had grown up in the tradition of limited legislative powers. The Crown lawyers, in maintaining the supremacy of the Parliament over the Colonies, could point to a long series of Statutes, including the Navigation Acts, which applied to them. Undoubtedly Parliament had a legal right to legislate for the Colonies, nor was its claim to impose taxes strictly illegal, though contrary to custom. George III and his supporters in the Ministry, like the Stuarts before them, failed to realize the unwisdom of insisting upon legal rights in the teeth of popular opposition.

Summary of the Causes of the Revolution. — This in brief was the situation: the Colonies were ready to break away. Politically they had grown apart from Great Britain, they were prepared for self-government by long training in managing their local concerns, and they had been estranged by frequent quarrels with the executives sent from Home. They were economically self-sufficing, and would only tolerate the selfish and exclusive system, framed in the interests of British merchants, so long as it was not enforced. The first attempt to make it a reality would, no doubt, of itself have provoked opposition. It happened, however, that the new policy was accompanied by an inexpedient innovation in taxation, which led to the first outbreak of resistance.

Grenville's New Customs Act and Provisions for Enforcing Trade Regulations (1764). — Up to the close of the Seven Years' War dense ignorance prevailed concerning the Colonies,[1] and the British Gov-

[1] The old Privy Council was the final authority in Colonial affairs, and all commissions were issued in the King's name "except those of the customs officials in America"; but, during the eighteenth century, various Parliamentary Statutes were passed relating to the Colonies; the Secretary of State for the Southern Department came to exercise much control over Colonial business, while independent departments like the Treasury and the Admiralty acquired an increasing share in the administration. From 1696 to 1783 the main channel of communication between the Colonies and the British Government was the Board of Trade and Plantations, a body which could inquire, inform and recommend, though the

ernment had never seriously regarded them as revenue producers. The new plan of imposing upon them a share of the Imperial burden had been contemplated in Bute's administration; but it was left to Grenville to carry it through. He found that the customs revenue from the Colonies amounted to less than £2000, which it cost nearly £8000 to collect, and further, that nine tenths of their tea, wine, sugar, and molasses were smuggled. In 1763 the old Molasses Act expired. Regardless of petitions, supported even by the royal Governor of Massachusetts, against the renewal of its provisions, Grenville passed another Act imposing several new duties. The duty on molasses was reduced one half and new bounties and concessions were offered; but all this was to no purpose, for stringent measures were taken to prevent smuggling, and the principle was announced in the preamble that the purpose was to raise a revenue.

The Stamp Act Suggested (1764). — The apprehension thus excited was further enhanced on the news of the design to quarter 10,000 troops in the Colonies. The East India Company and Ireland provided their own armies, and the British Government felt that the Americans should do the same, particularly since the several provinces were extremely reluctant to supply militia for the common defense, especially to send contingents to exposed points when their own particular localities were free from danger. To help defray the expenses of this standing army the Stamp Act was imposed. It was expected to yield about £100,000, an amount less than one third the cost of maintaining the contemplated military establishment. There is little doubt, however, that if the Colonies had paid their part willingly they would very soon have been called upon to provide the whole. Moreover, the form of tax was a decided innovation. Hitherto, internal taxation had been left to the provincial assemblies. Grenville proposed the stamp duties in 1764, but, though he preferred this form of tax as the fairest, as well as the easiest and least expensive to collect, he gave the Colonists a year to suggest a better scheme.

The Passage of the Stamp Act (22 March, 1765). — The Colonies, however, instead of suggestions, framed resolutions and addresses denying the right of Parliament to tax them at all. If the measure were carried, they asserted, "it would establish the melancholy

execution of its policy was left to the Ministers and to the Privy Council. The system was complex and decentralized. Most of the officials had no end of business to attend to besides that of the American Colonies; many were negligent or ignorant of Colonial conditions, for the Board of Trade, which was best qualified to furnish information, was frequently disregarded or overruled.

truth that the inhabitants of the Colonies are the slaves of the Britons from whom they are descended." In January, 1765, the measure, so momentous in its consequences, was carried in thinly attended session after a "most languid debate," and became law, 22 March. Unfortunately, Pitt, the stanchest champion of the Colonial cause, was confined in bed with one of his frequent attacks of gout. According to the Stamp Act, all newspapers, bills, policies of insurance, and legal documents were to be written on stamped paper to be sold by officials — who should be Americans — appointed for the purpose.

The Stamp Act Congress and the American Opposition (1765). — When the news reached America, where public sentiment was being worked upon by skillful agitators, storms of protest burst forth, and, 7 November, a Congress representing nine Colonies met in New York. Declaring: "that it is inseparably essential to the freedom of a people, and the undoubted right of Englishmen, that no taxes be imposed upon them, but with their own consent, given personally or by their representatives," [1] they sent petitions embodying their views to the King and to both Houses. But the opposition did not stop with peaceful methods. In Massachusetts there were wild outbursts of mob violence, an unruly example that was followed in many other Colonies. The merchants entered into agreements to import no more goods, to cancel orders already given, and to pay no debts to English creditors till the Act should be repealed. The lawyers refused to use the stamped paper and all legal business came to a standstill. On 1 November, the day the measure was to have gone into effect, shops were closed, bells were tolled, flags were hung at half mast, newspapers appeared with a death's head in place of the stamp required by law, and copies of the Act were hawked about the streets with the inscription: "The folly of England and the ruin of America." Finding that it was hopeless to transact business otherwise, the Governors were obliged to issue orders "authorizing non-compliance with the Act."

The Fall of Grenville (July, 1765). — The Opposition had been encouraged by the fall of Grenville in July, 1765. For some time George had wanted to get rid of him. His Ministry was weak and unpopular in Parliament, and had aroused an increasing spirit of dissatisfaction among the people; also he had proved to be a disappointment personally, since he was too stubborn to suit the King's purposes and wore him out with constant interviews and long lectures. His only reason for continuing to put up with him was the

[1] This meant in their own provincial assemblies.

dreadful alternative of falling into the clutches of a Whig Ministry. Finally, however, Grenville became so intolerable that George dismissed him and called in the Whigs under the leadership of the Marquis of Rockingham, intending to submit to them only until he could make another arrangement.

The Rockingham Ministry (1765–1766). — The Rockingham Ministry was a "mixture of wornout veterans and raw recruits." Lord Rockingham, their leader, who possessed vast estates and extensive influence, was lacking in knowledge and industry and was a bad and reluctant speaker; but he was modest, amiable, and thoroughly upright. Though far from strong, the combination, by sheer force of character and united devotion to the public service, not only set a noble example, but made a strong fight against the arbitrary ambition of the King and the prevailing corruption, and carried through important remedial measures. It repealed the Stamp Act, secured the parliamentary condemnation of general warrants, and put an end to the practice of depriving military officers of their command for political opposition. All this it accomplished in the teeth of the constant and underhanded opposition of the King, and, except in the case of the Stamp Act, without the much needed help of Pitt, who refused to join them. While sympathizing with their measures he was opposed to government by an aristocratic Whig connection that did not rest on the good will of the King and people.

The Advent of Edmund Burke (1765). — In the session of 1765–1766 Edmund Burke made his first appearance in Parliament. The son of a Protestant Irish attorney, he had come as a young man to London, where he was soon recognized as a writer of wide learning, deep discernment, and uncommon power of literary expression. In 1765 he became the secretary of Rockingham, through whose patronage he secured his seat. Although regarded by men of later generations as the most profound political philosopher of his time, the mediocrities and placemen who then made up the House of Commons failed to appreciate his lofty ideals and were repelled by his partisanship, his stormy temper, as well as by his persistent and overlong speeches, which emptied the House so regularly that he was known as the "dinner bell." Nevertheless, he was recognized as a power to be reckoned with, and there were times when the sweep of his eloquence rendered him irresistible. He differed from Pitt not only upon many current questions, but in fundamental principles of policy. For example, in opposition to his older contemporary, he believed in building up a strong permanent party independent of the Crown. Moreover, while he strove against abuse — advocating im-

proved methods of election and leading the fight against placemen and parliamentary corruption — he was strongly opposed to any fundamental alteration of the machinery of the Constitution. Although the mainstay of the Rockingham party, he never held a seat in the Cabinet.

The Repeal of the Stamp Act (1766). — Burke made two speeches on the repeal of the Stamp Act which "filled the town with wonder," and Pitt championed the cause of the Colonies with his wonted fire. He rejoiced that the Colonies had resisted the attempted taxation and insisted that the Stamp Act be "repealed absolutely, totally, immediately." Effective as were these speeches, a still more clinching argument was the attitude of the British merchants who represented, in strong petitions, that the interruption of American trade and the non-payment of debts had already involved a loss of £4,000,000. In vain did the King, who assured Rockingham that he was for repeal, seek to block the efforts of the Ministry by secret instructions to his agents in Parliament. Unfortunately, the Bill for repeal which passed both Houses in March, 1766, was coupled with a Declaratory Act — to which the Rockinghamites gave a reluctant consent — maintaining the right of Parliament to tax the Colonies. For the moment, however, this ill-advised and empty assertion did nothing to temper the joy with which the news was received throughout England and America. The trouble, however, had only begun. Most of the commercial restrictions still remained, and the Colonies, having won in their first encounter, were bound to resist, in the future, any measures that touched their interests. The Ministry, which, by its conciliatory policy might have won their confidence, did not long survive; for George took advantage of divisions among its members to turn it out of office in July.

The Grafton-Pitt Ministry (1766–1770). — The new Ministry was formed by Pitt, who finally consented to employ his great talents and popularity in defending the Crown against the great Whig houses and their connections. Declining to take the Premiership himself, he chose the office of Lord Privy Seal and selected as a figurehead the Duke of Grafton, one of his admirers, whose only other merits were his friendship for America and the fact that he had entered politics from a sense of duty rather than for personal or factional ends. Without a party following, Pitt was obliged to fill the remaining offices in such a haphazard fashion that his product was known as the "Mosaic Ministry." Moreover, he dumbfounded his friends by accepting a peerage. In ceasing to be the "Great Commoner," the Earl of Chatham — for that was his title — impaired his influence

with the people and shut himself out of the Lower House, which was the only proper field for his matchless eloquence. Tortured by the gout, he became increasingly irritable, and was finally attacked by a "gloomy and mysterious malady," probably nervous prostration, which led him to shun all public business. In March, 1767, he went into retirement, whence he did not emerge for over two years.

The Townshend Acts (1767). — In the absence of Pitt the chief power was seized by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Charles Townshend, who, when his budget for the year 1767 was defeated by a vote to reduce the land tax, rashly attempted, instead of resigning, to make up the deficiency by duties on American commerce. In thus reopening the controversy he shares with Grenville and the King the responsibility for the disastrous results that followed. Late in the spring he carried an Act imposing port duties on glass, lead, painters' colors, paper, and tea, legalizing writs of assistance, and providing that the revenue raised under the Act should be employed in maintaining civil officials independently of the Colonial assemblies. Any surplus was to go toward the support of troops. Another Act aimed to make the customs service more effective by establishing an American Board of Commissioners. Before it passed, Townshend had died, 1767, leaving a fatal legacy to his successors, involving principles most dangerous in their consequences — limitless possibilities of taxation, coercion, and crippling of trade.

The Resistance of the Colonies and the Weakness of the Grafton Ministry (1766–1769). — The hollowness of the distinction between internal and external taxation was now generally evident, and the smoldering embers of opposition in the Colonies again burst into flames. Unfortunately, Grafton's Ministry was unfitted either for conciliation or vigorous repression, and sorely harassed by the attacks of opposing factions, he weakly allowed the Cabinet, which had only sullenly acquiesced in the passage of the Townshend Acts, to fall more and more under the royal control. Townshend was succeeded by Lord North, a favorite of the King's, while, one by one, the Ministers were replaced by advocates of an uncompromising policy. In the Colonies such resoluteness was displayed and the non-importation agreements, which had been renewed, worked so effectively against British trade that the Ministry proposed, as a means of reconciliation, to remove all the Townshend duties except a tax of threepence per pound on tea. Grafton, and even North, wanted to do away with the duty on tea as well, but they were overruled. The measure, carried in 1770,

was announced to the Colonies in a "harsh and ungracious" circular letter.

The Middlesex Election (1768). — The situation at Home was also charged with trouble. High prices and hard times had aroused grave popular discontent which manifested itself in frequent riots and strikes. The general election of 1768 was marked by more buying and selling of votes than ever before, and those in the past had been corrupt enough. The most notable fact in the election, however, was the choice of John Wilkes as a member from Middlesex. Returning from abroad only a few weeks before the election, he had been escorted to and from the polling place by an unruly London mob. After the votes had been taken he submitted to the authorities. The decree of outlawry was reversed, but he was committed on the other charges [1] to the King's Bench prison, where he remained till April, 1770. During this period of nearly two years he was active with tongue and pen, and, besides contesting a significant parliamentary issue, managed to get himself elected as an alderman of London. In February, 1769, the Commons decided on Wilkes' expulsion. So far, they were technically within their rights, for they were the sole judges of the validity of election returns. On his reëlection, however, they overstepped their authority by declaring him incapable of sitting in the existing Parliament. There was no law declaring ineligibility for any of the charges standing against him, and it required more than a resolution of either House to make one. Finally, on the fourth election, Colonel Luttrell, the Court candidate, though receiving a minority of the votes, was awarded the seat. The King, who had influenced the Commons partly through his "Friends" and partly by working on their jealousy of privilege, had won a temporary and costly victory. He had defied the rights of the electors, and Wilkes, who in the beginning was supported only by the enemies of the Court and the more turbulent among the masses, became the popular hero. In spite of annual motions in his behalf, he was never admitted to the Parliament of 1768, though he continued to be a thorn in the flesh of his opponents. In 1774 he was returned in the new general election and admitted without opposition, and in May, 1782, he finally carried a motion to expunge from the Journal the record of his incapacity made in 1769. He had given a decided impulse to public agitation outside, and had taught the Commons a lesson which they never forgot — that the voice of the electors could not be defied.

The "Letters of Junius" (1769–1772). — The example of Wilkes in the *North Briton* had greatly stimulated attacks on the Government

[1] See above, page 512.

in the newspapers. These were usually in the form of letters signed by a fictitious name, preferably that of a patriot of antiquity. The most famous are the "Letters of Junius," which have survived as an English classic. The first to attract attention appeared in the *Public Advertiser*, 21 January, 1769, and the series did not come to an end till 21 January, 1772. They owe their influence to three facts: the men and the times which they attacked, their wonderful style, and the mystery of their authorship. Junius, to be sure, had no firm grasp of general principles or liberal progressive views, having no sympathy, for example, either with the American cause or with parliamentary reform; but he had an intimate knowledge of the political situation, he saw clearly the weakness and the vices of the men in power and exposed them with fiendish skill. A man who wrote what Junius did naturally could not disclose his identity; but he realized fully that the effect which he produced was greatly enhanced by the baffling secrecy in which he wrapped himself. While fully fifty names have been suggested as possible authors of the letters, the weight of evidence points most conclusively to Sir Philip Francis, who in early life was an amanuensis to Pitt.

The End of the Grafton Ministry and the Advent of Lord North (1770). — Chatham, emerging from his seclusion in July, 1769, at once threw himself into opposition against the Ministry which he had constructed in its original form. He vehemently denounced its American policy and its attitude toward the Middlesex election, in which, he maintained, the Commons had betrayed their constituents and violated the Constitution. When Grafton, finding his situation hopeless, resigned, 28 January, 1770, George at once offered the vacant place to Lord North, who continued to hold the Chancellorship of the Exchequer as well. North was neither a statesman nor an orator of the first rank; but he was an admirable gentleman, gifted with a ready wit and with excellent tact. Unfortunately, owing to indolent docility and undue fondness for the King, he allowed George to persuade him, against his better judgment, into measures so disastrous as to make his Administration one of the most inglorious in English history. Again and again he begged to resign, only to yield when George begged him not to desert him. In the face of bitter attack he placidly slept on the Treasury Bench, and made no effective effort to check the blundering and corruption for which he was officially responsible. After a decade of tireless and scrupulous efforts, George III had made his personal power supreme, and as long as North remained in office the King ruled as well as reigned; but his policy proved so fatal in its results that he was at length obliged to resign the conduct of affairs to a Minister

responsible to public opinion. One result, however, he achieved, — he broke the power of the Whig oligarchy beyond hope of recovery.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

Horace Bleackley, *Life of John Wilkes* (1917); Sir W. P. Treloar, *Wilkes and the City* (1917).

For further references, see ch. XLIII.

CHAPTER XLIII

THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION AND THE END OF THE PERSONAL ASCENDANCY OF GEORGE III (1770–1783)

The North Ministry and the Ascendancy of the King (1770–1782). — Contrary to expectation, North's Ministry, described as a "forlorn hope," remained in power longer than all the previous Ministries of the reign combined. George III to a large degree directed the policy of the Government, and his extensive use of patronage and corruption, the activity of his "Friends," together with the adroitness of North as a party leader and the dissensions between the Rockingham and Chatham Whigs, enabled him to maintain a "crushing and docile majority" in Parliament.

The Grenville Election Act (1770). — Nevertheless, the Opposition succeeded in carrying one or two measures of reform. First in importance was a Bill introduced by Grenville for trying disputed elections. Formerly such cases had been tried by a committee of the whole House, with the result that they had been invariably decided in favor of the candidate whose party had a majority in the Commons, quite regardless of the rights of the electors. According to the new arrangement forty-nine members were chosen by lot: from them each party removed one member alternately until the number was reduced to thirteen, and then added one member each. The body of fifteen thus constituted was sworn to act impartially and to render its decisions independently of Parliament. As each party would naturally seek to exclude the abler men among its opponents, the method of reduction was known as "knocking the brains out of the committee," but the Act, limited at first to seven years, worked so well in practice that in 1774 it was made permanent.[1]

The Struggle over the Reporting of Debates (1771). — In the session of 1771 the Commons became involved in a quarrel with the press over the question of reporting debates. In view of the growing strength of public opinion, it was unwise to attempt to keep its proceedings

[1] It remained in force till 1868, when the duties were handed over to the judges.

secret, and it was only natural that erroneous and unfair accounts of what was said and done should be spread abroad in print. The matter came to an issue when the House of Commons sought to arrest some offending printers, whom the Lord Mayor and aldermen of London undertook to protect. The result of the struggle was really another step in the direction of the freedom of the press, for, although the House still maintained that publication of debates was a breach of privilege, no further attempt was made to punish the reporters or printers. The great progress of the press as a political factor is one of the most significant features of this period: next to the failure of George's American policy it played the most important part in putting an end to the personal ascendancy of the Monarchy, which he had succeeded in reviving.

The Royal Marriage Act (1772). — With his exalted ideas of royalty, it was a keen distress to George III when two of his brothers married below their station. To prevent such indiscretions for the future, which would inevitably lower the prestige of the kingly family and, in case of a secret alliance, might bring confusion to the succession, he procured the passage of the Royal Marriage Act. It provided that no descendant of George II under twenty-six years of age could contract a valid marriage without the consent of the Sovereign, nor after that age, except by the sanction of Parliament. While working hardship to individuals, the Act, which remains substantially in force today, has proved beneficial from the public standpoint.

The Boston Massacre (5 March, 1770). — Meantime, early in 1770, the first blood had been shed in the controversy between Great Britain and her American Colonies. For some time, the more unruly elements in Boston had been annoying the British troops until, on the evening of 5 March, they were provoked into firing upon their tormentors. Whoever was to blame, the "Boston Massacre" excited the fiercest indignation throughout the Colonies. Yet when the soldiers were brought to trial, leading patriots volunteered to defend them, and all were acquitted except two who received light sentences.

The Hutchinson Letters (1773–1774). — Although the Government paid little attention to the Colonies for three years, the unrest there grew steadily. Extremists were active; mobs were frequent, loyalists were roughly handled, in some cases tarred and feathered; revenue officers were obstructed in the performance of their duties; and in 1773 Colonial committees of correspondence were formed which, in conjunction with local committees organized the previous year, furnished a complete system of machinery for united revolutionary action. Early in this year, Benjamin Franklin, who was acting as agent for

Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and two of the other Colonies, procured certain confidential letters written by Hutchinson [1] to a former secretary of Grenville, in which the methods which the British Government should employ in dealing with the Colonies were very frankly discussed. He sent them to Massachusetts to be handed about among a few of the leading patriots, on condition that they should not be published or even copied. Nevertheless, they soon found their way into print, were circulated throughout the Colonies, and aroused the greatest indignation. Franklin, who had occasion to appear before the Privy Council, 29 January, 1774, was denounced by Wedderburn, the Solicitor-General, in terms of studied insult. The Council roared with laughter while Franklin stood without moving a muscle. His methods of procuring the letters may have been questionable; but, since he was an old and eminent man, the treatment which he received was bound to turn him into an uncompromising opponent of the English Government, and to affect hosts of sympathizers in the same way.

The Boston Tea Party (16 December, 1773). — Meantime, the Government, by an ill-advised attempt to assist the East India Company whose affairs were in a bad way, opened the breach still wider. Among other measures of relief it was provided that a large amount of tea which the Company had on hand, should be sent from England free of duty and subject only to a tax of threepence per pound at the American ports. Since the tea sold in England was burdened with duties aggregating a shilling a pound, the Colonists were greatly favored over the home consumer. It has commonly been said that what they objected to was the principle of taxation involved, and that North would have done wisely to impose the duty at the time of export, leaving the Company to reimburse itself by a proportional increase of price on the sale of the goods in America; however, it has recently been shown that the objection was not so much to the tax as to the fact that the tea was consigned to friends of the Government, and that the resistance was instigated mainly by the English and American merchants, who resented being discriminated against in order that a great monopoly might be benefited. Toward the close of the year 1773, consignments of East India tea were shipped to Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and Charleston. On the night of 16 December, a body of men, disguised as Indians, boarded the vessels which had recently arrived in Boston and emptied three hundred and forty chests into the harbor. The ships for New York and Philadelphia returned without landing their cargoes, while the consignment for Charleston was stored in the custom house, whence it was sold later.

[1] He had been Governor of Massachusetts Bay since 1771.

The Acts of 1774. — The action at Boston, following upon the heels of the printing and circulation of the Hutchinson letters, determined George III to make an example of the town and at the same time to impose such coercion upon Massachusetts as would break its spirit and check further resistance. To that end, four "penal laws" were passed in 1774. The first closed the harbor of Boston and transferred the port to Salem until the losses of the East India Company should be made good. The second amended the charter of the Province, increased the power of the Governor, transferred to the Crown the nomination of councilors, and provided that town meetings, regarded as "nurseries of sedition," should not be held without the Governor's consent. The third enacted that all persons charged with a capital offense in executing the law in Massachusetts should be taken to Nova Scotia or to England for trial. The fourth was a new Quartering Act. The so-called "Quebec Act," passed the same year, extended the boundaries of Canada to the Mississippi on the west and to the Ohio on the south, granted freedom of worship to Roman Catholics, and allowed them to be tried by French law in civil cases, though in criminal matters the English law was to prevail. It provided, further, that the Governor-General should be assisted by a legislative council appointed by the Crown; there was to be no representative assembly, and taxation was reserved to the British Parliament. The measure, designed to deal with problems and promises arising from the Peace of 1763, was a wise and just one, for it gave the Canadians — nine tenths of whom were French — what they expected and desired, and they showed their satisfaction by remaining loyal throughout the ensuing war. The American Colonies, however, were furious, for it seemed to them a design to cut them off from the western lands which they claimed, and to extend "Popery" and arbitrary government to their very doors.

The First Continental Congress (5 September, 1774). — The Ministry had calculated that the leaders would be intimidated by a show of force and that the other Colonies would not support Massachusetts. On the contrary, the repressive measures of 1774 called forth a determined and united opposition from north to south and led swiftly to the final crisis. On 5 September a Congress met at Philadelphia in which all the thirteen provinces, except Georgia, were represented. Doubtless the majority, while insistent on redress of grievances, hoped that some means of averting the conflict might be arranged. Owing, however, to the activity of the aggressive party, the Congress took a series of decided steps. It approved the "Suffolk Resolves" [1] looking toward armed resistance in case of necessity; it demanded the revo-

[1] So called because they were passed in Suffolk County, Massachusetts.

cation of a number of recent laws, notably those of 1744; it drew up a declaration of rights; it framed general non-importation and non-exportation agreements; it sent a petition to the King and an address to the English people, after which it adjourned till May.

The Attitude in Parliament and in the Ministry. — Chatham, who had risen from a sick-bed in time to lift his voice against the last of the repressive Acts of 1774, rejoiced in the "manly wisdom and calm resolution of Congress." Yet he was anxious to avert a rebellion, foreseeing that France and Spain would seize the opportunity to avenge their defeat in the Seven Years' War. Moreover, both he and Burke were insistent on regulation of trade, failing to realize that the Colonies would now oppose that as strenuously as they had resisted the attempts to tax them. A few of the Ministers, including North, were also inclined to conciliation, though they were ready to do the King's will, while Parliament was, since the general election of 1774, more than ever under royal control. Nevertheless, the Opposition in Parliament kept up a zealous but futile agitation against coercion. Both Chatham and Burke, early in 1775, introduced conciliation schemes which failed to pass, and numerous petitions from the commercial towns were "shelved." On 20 March, North, with the consent of the King, did move a resolution, providing that if any Colony would pay its quota toward the common defense and the expenses of the civil administration no taxes would be imposed except for regulation of trade. Though it carried, it came too late.

The Outbreak of War; Lexington and Concord (19 April, 1775). — Already Massachusetts had been declared in rebellion. Soon after, on 19 April, occurred the memorable skirmishes of Lexington and Concord which opened the war that lasted until American independence was secured. The result was due to the courage and persistence of a resolute minority. Many were opposed to fighting at all. Others, who in the beginning put their hand to the plow, later sought to turn back. Spread through the Colonies there was a large and influential body of loyalists numbering from a third to a half of the population. In a minority in New England, it formed a majority in the Middle Colonies and fully equaled the patriot party in the South. In England, at the beginning of the war, the King and his agents not only controlled Parliament but were supported by the bulk of the nobility and landed gentry, the clergy of the Established Church and the legal profession. The opposition was confined to the merchants, the Dissenting preachers and the laboring classes.

Comparative Strength of the Combatants. — The troops who enlisted on the Colonial side were mostly raw, insubordinate, and unwilling

to serve for any length of time away from their own neighborhoods. The total population was less than three million souls, funds were scanty, and the supply of arms, ammunition, clothes, and provisions was lamentably inadequate. The Colonists had to contend against a wealthy country with a population fully three times their own, against trained armies and a navy reputed to be invincible. Owing, however, to recent economies and dishonest contractors, both arms of the service were reduced in numbers [1] and faulty in equipment. Then the British undervalued the fighting capacity of the Americans and the obstacles to be overcome. The country which was to be subdued was three thousand miles off and extended over a thousand miles of seacoast. There could be no theater of war, for the vast stretch of country was cut into pieces by many and great rivers, and reached back to a region of trackless forests. It was difficult to conquer and impossible to hold. The Colonies were hardy and resourceful, they had a widely extended militia system [2] and they had a Commander whose greatness of character and devotion to duty have rarely been equaled. The British generals proved singularly ineffective, and confined their attention mainly to taking and holding the leading seaboard towns, when their best chance of success lay in tracking down and destroying the opposing army. The issue was only decided, however, when France and Spain finally threw their weight in the scale against Great Britain.

The Meeting of the Second Continental Congress (10 May, 1775). Washington, Commander-in-Chief. — The Continental Congress assembled at Philadelphia for its second meeting, 10 May, 1775. It assumed executive powers, rejected North's plan of conciliation, and provided for the organization into a Continental Army of the troops which had flocked to the blockade of Boston after the Lexington fight. Doubtless their most important step was the appointment of Washington as Commander-in-Chief, 15 June; for to him more than to any other single man is due the triumph of the American cause.

[1] The British army at the opening of the war numbered less than 40,000. George had tried unsuccessfully for some time to increase this establishment. When a larger force became imperative he hired German mercenaries, a step against which both the English and the American Whigs protested bitterly. Much more reprehensible was the employment of Indians. They proved of little value in regular fighting; for they fled to the woods at moments of danger when they were most needed, and were guilty of massacring defenseless women and children in lonely exposed settlements. Though to a less degree, the Americans were not free from blame in the employment of Indians.

[2] Though its efficiency was weakened by the custom of short term enlistments.

Bunker Hill (17 June, 1775). The Siege of Boston. — Before he arrived in Boston the Battle of Bunker Hill had occurred, 17 June, in which the bravery of the British troops and the stupidity of their generals were alike conspicuous. It was a defeat for the Americans with all the moral effects of a victory. The siege of Boston continued for nine months, though the American Commander found the greatest difficulty in holding his ill-assorted forces together during the winter. Howe, who had superseded Gage in October and was "equally incompetent," was finally forced to evacuate the town, 17 March, 1776. Thence he sailed to Halifax, where he waited for reënforcements in order to attack New York. King George, who was disappointed on his hope that the Southern Colonies would remain loyal, finally sent an expedition against the Carolinas; but an attempt, in June, to reduce Charleston was heroically repulsed, and the British Commander Clinton sailed to New York to join Howe. For three years the South was left free to send help to the North.

The Declaration of Independence (4 July, 1776). — By the beginning of 1776 the idea of separation had become very strong in the Colonies, which hitherto had been fighting mainly to secure redress of grievances. The change of sentiment was due to various causes, among them the employment of German troops and the discovery that King George, and not the Ministry or Parliament, was responsible for the coercive policy of the past few years. More influential than all else, however, was a pamphlet by Thomas Paine entitled *Common Sense*. Paine was a radical, and later a freethinker, who had come to America from England in 1774, and had been warmly welcomed by Franklin. On 4 July, 1776, Congress at Philadelphia adopted the Declaration of Independence, which was printed the following day and signed by such members as were present, 2 August.

The Campaign of 1776. — In spite of the Whig Opposition the Government made vigorous preparations for the campaign of 1776. The military operations of this year centered about New York. Howe, with his Halifax forces, his reënforcements and the troops of Clinton, had an army of 25,000, to which Washington, who had hurried from Boston, could only oppose 19,000 ill-equipped and half-trained men. He was driven successively from Long Island, from Manhattan Island, then over the Hudson into New Jersey and finally across the Delaware. It was only Howe's incapacity and his own energy that prevented his "disorderly mob" from being utterly crushed. Suddenly, however, he revived the dying hopes of his countrymen by recrossing the Delaware on Christmas night

and capturing a Hessian force at Trenton. Neither Commander attempted anything further till spring. In England, the situation was far from satisfactory; for it was impossible to procure sailors except by impressment and extravagant bounties, and expenses were so heavy that another loan had to be raised and new and burdensome taxes imposed.

Burgoyne's Campaign (1777). — The British plan of campaign for 1777 was suggested by General Burgoyne. He was to lead an army down from Canada, by way of Lake Champlain and the Hudson, and to effect a junction at Albany with Howe, who was to march up from New York. Had the plan succeeded, New England would have been isolated, and the British would have been able to concentrate their efforts against the Middle and Southern provinces. The coöperation of Howe was essential, in order to prevent the Americans from thrusting an army in between and crushing Burgoyne before the junction could be effected. Howe, as usual, did the wrong thing; he decided to proceed first against Philadelphia, trusting that he could return in time to coöperate with Burgoyne. Obliged to take the long route by Chesapeake Bay and forced to fight a battle with Washington, whom he defeated at Brandywine, it was 27 September before he occupied Philadelphia. He spent another month in opening up the Delaware in order to secure his communications with New York, and then passed the winter restfully in Philadelphia while his troops and officers wasted their time in idleness and social diversions. Washington, who had been repulsed 4 October, in an attempt to enter the town, went into winter quarters at Valley Forge. His troops, half starved and almost barefoot, seemed on the verge of dissolution; but, during those gloomy months, they were drilled into an effective fighting machine by Baron Steuben, a German officer who had adopted the American cause. Meanwhile, events had happened which turned the tide of the war.

The Failure and Surrender of Burgoyne. — Burgoyne's first movements had promised well. George on receipt of the news is said to have rushed into the Queen's rooms crying: "I have beat them! beat all the Americans"; but his rejoicing proved premature. The invaders had a rough country to travel over, they found it difficult to procure supplies, and a strong American force was collected to meet them on the west bank of the Hudson. Defeated in a series of engagements, and surrounded by a force outnumbering his own by four to one, Burgoyne surrendered to General Gates at Saratoga, 17 October, 1777. The miscarriage of the British campaign of 1777 determined France to throw her weight in the scale, Spain followed

later, and the conflict between Great Britain and her Colonies was enlarged into another great European struggle.

The French Alliance (1778). — For some time, the French and Spanish Governments had been secretly providing the Americans with money and supplies, and many Frenchmen, chief among them the Marquis de Lafayette, had volunteered for service in the Continental Army. Benjamin Franklin, who went as diplomatic agent to France in December, 1776, was warmly welcomed by the circle who were beginning to interest themselves in those problems of religious and political philosophy which heralded the approach of the French Revolution. The French Government, however, had no enthusiasm for the American cause; its aim was to revenge the humiliation it had suffered at the hands of Pitt and to recover as much as possible of the Colonial trade and possessions it had lost. On 6 February, 1778, a formal treaty of alliance was concluded with the United States [1] by which it was agreed that, in case of war between France and Great Britain, neither party would make peace without the other, or until the independence of the United States should be acknowledged. This alliance proved a godsend to the American cause. It created an effective diversion against Great Britain; it opened French ports to American privateers; it brought increased money, supplies, munitions of war, powerful fleets, and finally an army. At last the steadfastness of Washington and those who supported him was to be rewarded.

The Party Situation in England. The Death of Chatham (1778). — The American disaster encouraged the Opposition to renewed attacks against the Government. Their force was greatly weakened, however, by a sharp difference in policy. Chatham, though continuing to urge extreme concessions, stopped short at independence, while the Rockingham party were now ready to grant even that. North, who had carried on the war for years against his better judgment, after begging the King in vain to allow him to resign, finally introduced and carried a conciliation bill conceding practically all that Chatham had advocated. Commissioners were sent to America, but Congress, now backed by France, would listen to no terms which did not include recognition of independence, and when the commissioners appealed to the people in an ill-advised manifesto, they met with a well-merited rebuff. The Government in its straits had already made overtures to Chatham, who might have had some influence with the revolutionists, but he would take no steps without an "entire new Cabinet." George III replied stolidly that "no

[1] The name assumed by the Colonies in the Declaration of Independence.

advantage to the country nor personal danger to himself would make him stoop to the Opposition." Stiff-necked as he was, George cannot be wholly blamed, for the Opposition was bitter, it rejoiced unpatriotically at the American successes, and obstructed his military plans. The majority, to be sure, had laudable reasons for desiring the failure of the King's war, some because they thought it unrighteous, others because it would break down the royal ascendancy, force upon the Crown a Ministry of the people, and put an end to the régime of corruption. Naturally, though, George could not see this; moreover, many supported his policy from a sincere feeling that the greatness of England depended upon the retention of the Colonies even by force. Chatham, broken by illness, appeared in the House of Lords, 7 April, 1778, and made his last speech, which was an earnest plea against conceding American sovereignty and yielding to the claims of France. In the midst of the debate he fell in a fit and was taken home, where he died 11 May. Thus passed the "great, illustrious, faulty being" who had achieved so much for England. His death made for a partial unity in the ranks of the Opposition.

The Military and Naval Events of 1778–1779. — Clinton, who had succeeded Howe as Commander-in-Chief, evacuated Philadelphia, 18 June, 1778, and hastened to New York to meet an expected French attack. In July a French fleet arrived, but, after failing in an attack on Newport, without attempting anything further, departed for the West Indies, where during the naval operations of 1778–1779 the advantage lay with them. Meantime, the center of the war had shifted to the Southern Colonies. In November, 1778, Clinton sent a British force to Georgia, which captured Savannah, overran the whole Province, and opened the way for an invasion of South Carolina before the close of the year. On 12 April, 1779, Spain joined France in an alliance against Great Britain, and declared war 16 June. Her first step was to attempt the recovery of Gibraltar, which, however, was ably defended by General Eliott during a memorable three years' siege. All the while, American privateers were proving increasingly troublesome to British commerce, which the combined French and Spanish fleets strove in vain to destroy.

The Gordon Riots (1780). — Suddenly in war-weary England a wave of anti-Roman Catholic fanaticism swept over the country. In 1778 a bill had been passed "enabling Roman Catholics who abjured the temporal jurisdiction of the Pope to purchase and inherit land, and freeing their priests from liability to imprisonment." A similar measure for Scotland was defeated, owing to a violent popu-

lar outcry which manifested itself in riots at Glasgow and Edinburgh. This encouraged a number of bigots in England to form a Protestant Association under the presidency of Lord George Gordon, a half-crazed scion of a noble Scottish house. On 2 June, 1780, he marched to Westminster at the head of 60,000 persons bearing a monster petition demanding the repeal of the Act of 1778. The firm refusal of Parliament led to a furious uprising, and from the 2d to the 7th mob violence reigned in the City. Some who took part were honest fanatics, but the majority were the criminal and disorderly class more bent on plunder than the safeguarding of religion. The authorities seemed paralyzed, peaceful citizens were obliged to wear blue cockades and to join the cry "No Popery!" to protect their lives and property. The man who finally rose to the occasion was King George, who declared that there was at least one magistrate who would do his duty. By a royal Order in Council the King's troops and the militia were called out, and dispersed the rioters. Smaller riots took place in Bristol, Hull, and Bath, but the Government stood by its Relief Acts. The whole affair is a curious example of belated bigotry and of the weakness of the public authorities.

The Armed Neutrality (1780). — In 1778, France had adopted a novel principle in maritime law, namely, that the goods of neutral Powers trading with belligerents were exempt from seizure, provided they were not contraband of war. Holland, because of her great carrying trade, welcomed this innovation, as did Frederick the Great; for he saw that it would weaken Great Britain, who had always exercised freely the right of seizure of ships engaged in commerce with her enemies. Early in 1780, Catherine of Russia was induced to issue a declaration asserting, in addition to the above principle, that only specified goods were contraband and that blockades to be binding must be effectual. On the basis of this declaration — accepted by France, Spain, and the Americans — Denmark, Sweden, Prussia, and the Emperor joined her in a league of "armed neutrality." While Great Britain found it necessary henceforth to deal cautiously with neutral ships, since she was dependent upon the Baltic Powers for naval stores, the league proved rather an "armed nullity" in practice. Moreover, the British gained rather than lost by adding Holland to the list of their opponents, 20 December; for her navy was not strong, and since she was no longer a neutral, her commerce and her colonies could be attacked with impunity.

The War in 1780–1781. The Southern Campaign. — Early in 1780, Clinton went south in person and attacked Charleston, which surrendered 12 May. Leaving Cornwallis, who soon overran the

greater part of South Carolina, he returned to New York, for another French fleet was under way, laden with troops to assist Washington. The year, however, was a gloomy one for the Americans in the North as well as in the South. Washington's army had spent the winter of 1779–1780 at Morristown, exposed to rigorous weather and "constantly on the point of starving"; a French squadron, which arrived in July with 6000 troops under the command of Rochambeau, was blockaded in Newport, Rhode Island, by a British fleet and did nothing; the paper money issued by Congress had so depreciated that a hundred dollars in bills was only worth one of gold, and France was so nearly bankrupt that her chief Minister, Vergennes, suggested a truce. For the remainder of the war the decisive fighting was in the Southern Colonies and on the sea. In December, 1780, General Nathanael Greene, who, though he lost battles, had a genius for winning campaigns, was sent to the Carolinas, where with the help of guerrilla leaders he managed to check the British. In May, 1781, Cornwallis after a series of Pyrrhic victories marched into Virginia to join a British force which Clinton had sent to that Province. Before the end of the year, the forces which he left behind had abandoned everything in the Carolinas except Charleston.

The Surrender of Cornwallis (19 October, 1781). — It was a time when "some splendid advantage was essentially necessary . . . to revive the expiring hopes and languid exertions of the country," when the "poor old currency was breathing its last gasp." Assured of the coöperation of Admiral de Grasse — who had eluded the British Admiral Rodney and reached the American coast in August, 1781 — Washington and Rochambeau now arranged a joint movement against the British. Washington wanted to strike at Clinton in New York, but yielded to the French, who preferred to direct their efforts against Cornwallis in Virginia. Cornwallis — who had marched north against the wishes of Clinton, his superior officer, and who was at odds with him in consequence — concentrated his forces at Yorktown, on a tongue of land between the mouths of the York and James Rivers where he could be easily bottled up. Admiral Graves, who sailed south in pursuit of the French fleet from Rhode Island, found de Grasse blocking the Chesapeake and was so roughly handled that he went back to New York to refit. Cornwallis, cut off from all help from the sea, surrendered to Washington and Rochambeau, 19 October, 1781. On that same day, Graves had again left New York bearing on board a relieving army under Clinton, but finding that they were too late, they turned back. The catastrophe at Yorktown sealed the fate of the war.

The Resignation of North (20 March, 1782). — The King received the news with his accustomed fortitude, and stubbornly insisted on continuing the fight, but North now gave up all hope. Various reverses followed; the peace party grew to be overwhelming in Parliament and throughout the country. The Opposition combined forces against the Government; and, 20 March, North, after barely escaping a vote of want of confidence,[1] announced his resignation. Although they had acted together for the moment, there were still two parties in the Opposition. Lord Shelburne led the old Chatham Whigs opposed to party connection and American independence, while Rockingham, backed by Burke and Charles James Fox, stood for both of these policies. As the lesser of two evils, George invited Shelburne to form a Ministry. When he refused, George was finally forced to accept Rockingham as Prime Minister, though he declined to negotiate with him personally. Shelburne was made Secretary for Home and Colonial Affairs and Charles James Fox became Foreign Secretary.[2]

The Second Rockingham Ministry (March-July, 1782), and Its Work. — The new Ministry, in spite of the royal attempts to thwart its efforts, accomplished much during its brief tenure of power. Contractors were excluded from the House of Commons and revenue officers were deprived of the right to vote, while Burke, after having tried for years, succeeded in carrying a measure of economical reform, which saved the country £72,000 a year by the abolition of useless offices. This Ministry also opened the peace negotiations and granted legislative independence to Ireland.

The Irish Situation. — Although the material condition of the people had improved during the century, Ireland was in a pitiable state at the opening of the reign. It was governed as a subject country; it was excluded from the benefits of the Navigation Acts and from all commerce that might compete with that of England. Greedy agents and middlemen crushed the peasantry with heavy rents and burdens, while the great landlords were mostly absentees. Arable lands were turned into pasture and rights of common were disregarded. Intense poverty and suffering were the result. Religious grievances were equally acute. Although the worst provisions of the penal laws were not enforced, Roman Catholics were

[1] Already, 6 April, 1780, the Opposition had succeeded in carrying a resolution in the Commons that: "the influence of the Crown has increased, is increasing, and ought to be diminished."

[2] The former combined the functions of the old Secretary of State for the Northern Department and the Secretary for American and Colonial Affairs, created in 1768. The latter took the place of the Secretary of State for the Southern Department.

excluded from office, from the practice of law, and the army. The poor were called upon to pay tithes for the support of the Anglican Establishment, whose clergy were indifferent to their interests and whom they hated as cordially as they loved their own ignorant and devoted priests. Parliament represented exclusively the Protestant aristocratic minority, and abuses in corruption and patronage flourished rankly. In 1761, a secret organization, known as the Whiteboys, from the white smocks which they wore, began to manifest the widespread resentment against enclosures and tithes by nocturnal raids in which they maimed the cattle and resorted to other violence. Their advent marks the beginning of secret associations and armed risings in Ireland.

The Independence of the Irish Parliament (1782). — Forced by the Irish leaders, Grattan and Flood, who took advantage of the American War to press their demands, Lord North, in 1778, removed a few of the restrictions on trade, and would have gone further but for the opposition of the English manufacturing interests. Another bill was passed enabling Catholics to secure leases for nine hundred and ninety-nine years, and even to inherit lands, provided they were not converts. As a means of receiving further concessions, non-importation agreements were formed; but another method proved more effective. The war had necessitated the removal of the Irish garrisons. To supply their place in defending the country from attack and internal disorder, the Irish Protestants[1] organized into bodies of volunteers. While thoroughly loyal, they were masters of the situation and insisted on their demands. In consequence, the English Parliament, at North's instigation, removed a number of the remaining trade shackles in 1779–80. About the same time a bill was passed freeing the Irish Dissenting Protestants from the sacramental test for office-holding. Grattan now began an eloquent and earnest demand for legislative independence. This was finally granted by the Rockingham Ministry in May, 1782.

The Revival of British Sea Power (1782). — The British still occupied New York, Charleston, and Savannah, and now their navy, which had at length been brought into shape, showed itself worthy of its high traditions. On 12 April, 1782, Rodney, having returned to the West Indies after an absence on sick leave, engaged de Grasse, who was planning to join the Spanish in an attack on Jamaica. The "Battle of the Saints," so called because it was fought off the Isle des Saintes, is notable for the successful employment of a form of

[1] Many of the Catholics would have joined them, but they were prevented at first by the old law forbidding them to bear arms.

tactics common in the Dutch wars of the seventeenth century. Recently revived, it was destined to be used with great effect in the next war with France. The form of fighting most in vogue during the interval had been to engage the enemy ship by ship, van to van, center to center, and rear to rear. By the new maneuver, known as "breaking the line," the British ships would force a gap somewhere in the enemy's line, isolate a portion of her ships and overwhelm them by force of numbers.[1] At The Saints, the French line was cut in two places and the attack directed against her center, de Grasse was captured together with five of his ships, Jamaica was saved, and a serious blow struck at the French navy. In September, Eliott met a final attack on Gibraltar with admirable skill and daring, though the siege was not finally raised till February, 1783, after the close of the war.

Lord Shelburne (1737–1805) and Charles James Fox (1749–1806). — The Rockingham Cabinet worked together in securing domestic reforms and granting legislative independence to Ireland; but a split came over its chief problem — the peace negotiations. This was due to the strained relations between the two remarkable men who dominated all the others. The Earl of Shelburne was a progressive thinker quite in advance of his time in many of the policies which he advocated. In spite of his great abilities and broad outlook — possibly to some degree because of them and to his undisguised contempt for parties as well — he was, perhaps, the most unpopular and distrusted public man of his time. Charles James Fox was the son of Henry Fox, Lord Holland. At first he was chiefly noted for his extravagance, his dissipation, and for his reckless but brilliant opposition to all liberal measures; but, in 1774, he left the Tory party largely for personal reasons and passed the remainder of his life, mostly in opposition, as an ardent champion of popular liberty. Joining the Rockingham Whigs, he came under the influence of Burke, and ranged himself against the war against the Colonies as well as most of the other policies of the King. He was violent in his attacks on the Government, sometimes even forgetting loyalty to his country in the zeal with which he defended first the American and later the French Revolution; also, he was deficient in qualities of statesmanship and was a bad party manager. On the other hand, he was unusually gifted as a debater, with the rare power of stripping away all superfluities and penetrating directly to the heart of a question;

[1] It is no longer believed that Rodney was responsible for the revival of this form of fighting. Howe was among the first to take it up, while Rodney, who belonged to the old school, opposed it for some time.

moreover, notwithstanding his hot partisanship, his nature was generous, lovable, and noble; he was the chivalrous defender of the unfortunate and waged unselfish war upon religious intolerance and political oppression.

Opening of the Peace Negotiations. — Aside from personal differences, Shelburne and Fox represented opposing policies. Fox wanted to acknowledge the independence of the Americans immediately, in order to detach them from the French alliance, while Shelburne wished to make the acknowledgment of independence one of the conditions of a joint treaty with the Allies, as a means of obtaining better terms. The question was complicated from the fact that, so long as Shelburne's view prevailed, he remained in charge of the American negotiations as Colonial Secretary, while as soon as the United States were acknowledged as an independent Power, all diplomatic dealings with them would pass to Fox as Foreign Secretary. Then the agent, whom Fox named to treat with Vergennes at Paris, complained that he was hampered by the representative whom Shelburne had sent to treat informally with Franklin, and that the Colonial Secretary was concealing information from the Cabinet, whereupon Fox, furiously indignant, proposed, 30 June, 1782, the recognition of American independence forthwith. When he was outvoted in the Cabinet he threatened to resign. The very next day Rockingham died, and George III, seizing the chance to break the power of the party, appointed Shelburne head of the Ministry.

The Completion of the Peace Negotiations (1782–1783). — It was now possible to continue the peace negotiations without friction. Shelburne, however, soon came round to Fox's policy of detaching the Americans from the French alliance, and, to that end, acknowledged the independence of the United States, 27 September, 1782. Less than two months later the American commissioners,[1] 30 November, without consulting the French Minister, signed preliminaries of peace, on condition that a final treaty should be concluded after terms had been arranged between Great Britain and France. Owing to the conditional nature of the arrangement, the commissioners cannot be fairly charged with violating the terms of the alliance of 1778. On the other hand, suspecting with good reason that France was backing Spain in an effort to restrict American boundaries to the narrowest geographical limits, and, on her own account, was anxious to exclude the new country from Newfoundland fisheries, they had not observed their instructions from Congress to negotiate only in harmony with the French Government. The definitive treaty of peace

[1] Franklin was joined by John Jay in July and by John Adams in October.

between Great Britain and the United States was signed at Paris, 3 September, 1783. France and Spain signed their treaty with the British at Versailles on the same day.

The Treaty of Paris. — The chief terms of the Treaty of Paris were the following: (1) The independence of the United States was formally acknowledged and the boundaries of the new country defined. (2) The United States was to have the right to fish off the banks of Newfoundland and in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, as well as the right to cure fish on certain specified shores. (3) The navigation of the Mississippi was to be open to both countries. (4) The restitution of confiscated estates of loyalists was to be recommended by Congress to the several States.

The Treaty of Versailles. — France received certain of the West India Islands and restored some that she had conquered. Her rights in the Newfoundland fisheries were defined; she received, in full sovereignty, the islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon, where she had been allowed to dry fish, and her commercial establishments in India were restored. Spain, in return for certain concessions, retained Minorca and West Florida, which she had recently conquered, and Great Britain ceded East Florida back to her.

The Defeat of the King. — The United States, although she emerged from the contest poor and exhausted, had gained almost everything for which she had striven. Great Britain had lost the most valuable of her Colonies, but it was years before any change was manifest in the principles or practice of her colonial system, either administrative or economic. Nevertheless, at subsequent crises in her constantly increasing Empire she showed that she had not forgotten the costly lesson which she had learned. The more immediate result was at once evident. George's system of personal government had broken down, and, though he soon shook himself free from the hateful domination of the Whigs, he never succeeded in reviving his ascendancy.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

Narrative. William Hunt, *Political History of England, 1760–1801* (1905); also Robertson; Bright; Stanhope; Lecky, and *Cambridge Modern History*.

Constitutional. T. E. May (Lord Farnborough), *Constitutional History of England since the Accession of George III* (3 vols., the edition of 1912, ed. by Francis Holland, continues the work to 1911), the best work on the period; the arrangement is topical and not chronological.

Biography. The lives of Chatham cited in Chapter XLI above. Sir G. O. Trevelyan, *The Early Life of Charles James Fox* (1880); goes to 1774, an

admirable picture of the life of the period. J. Morley (Viscount), *Burke, A Historical Study* (1867), the best estimate of Burke's political position. Morley's *Edmund Burke* (1879) is a brilliant and valuable sketch. Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice, *Life of the Earl of Shelburne* (Marquis of Lansdowne) (3 vols., 1875–6, new ed., 1913) while aiming to place Shelburne in a favorable light, is a distinct contribution.

Contemporary. Horace Walpole, *Letters* (16 vols., ed. Mrs. P. Toynbee, 1903–5); Walpole is the acknowledged prince of English letter writers. His *Memoirs of the Reign of George III, 1760–1772* (4 vols., ed. G. F. R. Barker, 1894) and *Journals of the Reign of George III, 1771–83* (2 vols., ed. Doran, 1859) are gossipy and Whig in sympathy, but are the records of a keen observer. N. W. Wraxall, *Historical and Posthumous Memoirs, 1772–1784* (89) (ed. H. B. Wheatley, 2 vols., 1884), garrulous and amusing. *Correspondence of George III with Lord North*, 1768–83 (2 vols., 1867, ed. W. B. Donne) excellent for illustrating George III's system of personal government. Mme. D'Arblay, *Diary* (7 vols., 1854, new ed., A. Dobson), a graphic but adverse picture of life at the court of George III. *The Letters of Junius* (2 vols., 1904).

The American Revolution. For bibliography see Hunt, 465–6; *Cambridge Modern History*, VII, 780–788. The latter work, chs. V–VII, contains a good brief account of the causes and course of the Revolution. E. Channing, *History of the United States* (1912), vol. III, the best general work on the period. John Fiske, *American Revolution* (2 vols., 1891) is a very readable popular treatment. Sir G. O. Trevelyan, *The American Revolution* (4 vols., published 1899–1912) is a brilliant piece of writing marked by the Whig sympathy for the American cause, which may be used to supplement the Tory standpoint of Hunt. Carl Becker, *The Eve of the Revolution* (1918), a very suggestive contribution. For special phases of the subject see: G. L. Beer, *Commercial Policy of Great Britain toward the United States* (1893) and *British Colonial Policy* (1907); H. E. Egerton, *British Colonial Policy* (new ed., 1913); A. L. Cross, *The Anglican Episcopate and the American Colonies* (1902); C. H. Van Tyne, *The Loyalists in the American Revolution* (1902).

Military and Naval. Fortescue, *British Army;* Clowes, *Royal Navy;* Mahan, *Sea Power.*

Selections from the sources. Adams and Stephens, nos. 250–254. Robertson, pt. I, nos. XXXIV–XXXVII, pt. II, nos. XIV–XXI.

CHAPTER XLIV

EIGHTEENTH CENTURY ENGLAND TO THE EVE OF THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION

The Three Leading Characteristics of the "Eighteenth Century." — The century following the Revolution of 1688 does not, on the surface, present any striking features of organic growth. The course both of domestic and foreign affairs appears to be perplexed and meaningless: the former little more than a constant scramble for power and profit between various factions, usually of the dominant party, the latter chiefly occupied in a series of wars, complex and bewildering in their causes and their results. In each case, however, an important issue was being worked out. The political struggles at home produced the existing system of Cabinet and party government, while the wars abroad made Great Britain the World Power she is to-day. Then, thirdly, the period was marked by a veritable industrial revolution. These three characteristics must be considered each in turn.

The Cabinet and Party System. — The English Cabinet and party system is especially notable for the fact that its machinery is the most perfect that has yet been devised for speedily and peacefully voicing the will of the people, and because it is the system which has been adopted, with more or less variations, by the chief European Governments in recent times. It is essentially government by an executive committee of Parliament, whose members represent and are responsible to the majority of the House of Commons, which, in its turn, represents the qualified voters of Great Britain. Just as soon as the majority withdraws its support, the Cabinet either resigns or dissolves Parliament and submits to the verdict of a general election. Contrary to the earlier practice, the Sovereign no longer arbitrarily appoints and dismisses his Ministers, and ordinarily he does nothing without the advice of the body which has superseded him as the actual head of the State. The Cabinet is united under a head known as the Prime Minister, and its members are both jointly and severally

responsible to their party. Except in rare cases, if one goes they all go. The Cabinet system is essentially a post-Revolutionary product; for, it has been well said, while the Puritan Revolution determined that Parliament should be supreme, it was the subsequent course of events which determined how the sovereignty should be exercised.

Ministerial Responsibility after the Restoration. — Great strides in this direction were taken after the Restoration. Clarendon, though Charles II was ready to throw him over, was really forced out of office by a Parliamentary attack, while Danby had to be dismissed, in spite of the King's efforts to save him. Even yet, however, Parliament had not recovered the control of appointments which it had enjoyed for a brief period under the Lancastrians and had lost under the Yorkists and Tudors; moreover, it had no means of removal except by impeachments on serious charges. Meantime, the practice had become common of governing with the advice of a small group of men selected usually from the larger Privy Council. Charles II had more than one such Cabinet or Cabal, and so had James.

The Rise of Modern Parties. — While these advisers were still responsible to the King, the parties were already in making who were later to assume that control. Under the name Whigs and Tories they began to take permanent and tangible form during the Exclusion struggle, although their beginnings may be traced back to the Cavalier and Country parties. The Roundheads, of course, had been broken up by the Restoration, nor did they form a party in the modern sense, since they had no recognized voice in the regular and normal control of the Administration, which is the present function of the party in power. It remained for William, some years after his accession, to take the decisive step that resulted in a form of government controlled and administered by a body of men representing a particular policy.

Progress of Cabinet and Party Government under William III. — William's first Cabinet was composed of men of diverse opinions, for he aimed to balance parties. Within a few years, however, he began, apparently on the advice of Sunderland, to choose his Ministers exclusively from the Whig party — which was then in a majority in the Lower House, — gradually got rid of his Tory Ministers, and depended for a few years mainly on a body of Whig Ministers. William, however, remained the real head of the Government; he was his own Foreign Minister, acting often independently, sometimes in opposition to his Ministers, and frequently consulting outside advisers. Nor was there as yet any ministerial solidarity; for Par-

liament held individuals, not the whole body, responsible for a particular policy. However, the practice that was in the end to prevail — that the duties and responsibilities of government belonged not to the Privy Council as a whole, but to a small committee chosen and retained largely because of their ability to command a majority in the lower House — had been advised and tried. William's successor, Anne, had a Whig Ministry forced on her in the middle of her reign, but though a weak Sovereign she was anxious for personal rule, and, aided by a popular reaction, she was able to force out her unwelcome advisers and temporarily to check the progress of the new system.

The Completion of the System under the Hanoverians. — It was under the first Kings of the House of Hanover, George I and George II, that Cabinet government assumed practically its modern form. Not only was the lost ground regained, but the Prime Minister took the place of the Sovereign as head of the Cabinet; he became the leader of the majority party in power in the House of Commons, dependent rather on their support than on royal favor; while the Cabinet members came to act "as a unit under him," — came, at last, more and more frequently, to be responsible jointly as well as individually for their acts. Many reasons explain this striking development. For one thing the new Monarchs threw few obstacles in the way. George I, ignorant of the language and customs of the country and taking little interest in English affairs, soon ceased to attend Cabinet meetings, and George II followed his example. Moreover, their title was parliamentary rather than hereditary, and they had been called in by the Whigs, whose policy was to diminish as far as possible the royal prerogative. Another important factor was the ascendancy of Walpole who, during the years of his supremacy, would brook no rivals.

The Perfection of the System by the Extension of the Electorate. — George III attempted for a time personal in place of ministerial rule; but the new system had become too firmly established to be shaken permanently; consequently he had to give in before he had half finished his reign. The crowning step was taken in the nineteenth century, when by a series of reform bills the House of Commons was made truly representative of the people. Cabinet and party government as it exists to-day, while it is not the result of any principles embodied in the Revolution of 1688, was made possible by events which developed in consequence of that movement.

The Wars of the Eighteenth Century and Their Significance. — Passing to the external history of the period, the most evident feature

is the constant succession of wars. During the interval of one hundred and twenty-seven years which elapsed between the Revolution of 1688 and the overthrow of Napoleon at Waterloo in 1815 there were seven, occupying sixty-four years, or more than half the period.[1] They not only convulsed all Europe but extended over a wide area of the globe as well. While, at first sight, they seem to have no unity of cause or result, a closer study makes it clear that, so far as Great Britain is concerned, a single issue connects them all. Five began and ended with France, and, though the third began with Spain and the fifth with the American Colonies, France became involved in both before the close. The chief result of this persistent duel was that England gained an unrivaled commercial ascendancy and vast colonial possessions, chiefly at the expense of France.

In King William's War, which was directed mainly against the European ascendancy of Louis XIV, these issues were not yet evident, but the crippling of French resources had an important bearing on the subsequent struggles. In the War of the Spanish Succession many causes were operative, but commercial questions played a leading rôle; for the English entered the conflict largely from fear of the colonial monopoly which might result in case the House of Bourbon should acquire the Spanish inheritance, and secured by the Peace of Utrecht trade concessions and territories in the New World. In the three wars from 1739 to 1783, although many other questions were involved, a most significant factor was a prolonged struggle between England and France for the control of America and India. Great Britain lost the thirteen colonies, but she secured from France the territory now known as the Dominion of Canada and gained the upper hand in India. Even in the Napoleonic wars, as will be seen later, colonial issues were by no means overlooked. In this "gigantic rivalry between England and France" it will be necessary to search for the causes which led England to prevail.

The Rise of the Atlantic Seaboard States and the Decline of Portugal, Spain, and the Dutch. — Up to the middle of the fifteenth century the Mediterranean remained the center of commerce, and the chief seats of business and wealth were the Italian cities. But the capture of

[1] They were:
1. "King William's War," 1689–1697.
2. The War of the Spanish Succession, 1702–1713.
3. The War of the Austrian Succession, 1739–1748.
4. The Seven Years' War, 1756–1763.
5. The War of the American Revolution, 1775–1783.
6, 7. Two Wars with France, 1793–1802 and 1803–1815.

Constantinople by the Turks, in 1453, together with the subsequent discovery of new routes by sea to India and China and of the continent of America, led to the momentous result that the Atlantic took the place of the Mediterranean as a highway of commerce. Italy, harassed at the same time by invasions of rival sovereigns contending for dominion, and by the depredations of the rising Turkish sea power, rapidly declined. Gradually, the five Atlantic seaboard states, Portugal, Spain, the Dutch, France, and England, came to the front. The first three, one after another, fell back in the race, in spite of promising starts, leaving France and England to fight for the ultimate supremacy.

Reasons why Great Britain Prevailed over France. — France had great resources, broad territories, and industrial aptitude, yet she failed to prevail. Certain local causes were operative in America, — her object was to trade and to advance the Roman Catholic faith rather than to send colonists who would found homes, and her possessions were inferior from the standpoint of both climate and strategy to those of the English; but the chief reason for her failure was that her energies were divided between the New World and the Old. At the very time that she was contending for colonial supremacy she was obliged to fight constantly in Europe to maintain her ascendancy, frequently to defend her own borders. Great Britain entered comparatively late in the race for maritime supremacy; for she first became a recognized Sea Power in the time of Elizabeth, and it was not till the following century that she acquired any considerable colonial possessions. By her buccaneering expeditions and her repulse of the Armada, she was a powerful factor in breaking down the supremacy of Spain. Under the first two Stuarts, English colonies were established in Virginia, New England, and Maryland; then, under the Commonwealth and the Protectorate, with the navy developed to an effectiveness hitherto unequaled, war was opened with Holland and another blow struck at the monopoly of Spain. The progress continued after the Restoration. Charles II obtained Bombay by his marriage, New York was captured in the second Dutch War, the Carolinas and Pennsylvania were founded and Delaware was acquired. After the Restoration, England united for a time with her former commercial rival, Holland, in a common effort to check France and Catholicism. Holland, however, who never recovered from the effect of her wars with her present ally, was further exhausted by the strain of the great efforts against the French and ceased to be formidable. While Great Britain's only remaining antagonist was seriously handicapped, the British were protected from European attack by intervening waters;

they were not obliged to send armies abroad unless they chose, and, as a matter of fact, confined themselves largely to subsidizing allies in the Continental struggles, thus leaving their energies free to develop their navy, and to extend their colonial possessions.

The Industrial Revolution. — In all three of the characteristic features of the eighteenth century, the period between 1688 and 1784 may be considered as a unit. While the development of the party system was not finally completed until the reform of Parliament gave the people a full share of representation, the Cabinet had, by 1760, taken practically its modern shape, and the advent of the younger Pitt to power twenty-four years later marked the end of the efforts of George III to stop its growth. If Great Britain's position as a World Power was not secure until the overthrow of Napoleon, she had by 1763 driven the French out of Canada and become the dominant power in India, and within twenty years the American Revolution, together with the teachings of Adam Smith, had contributed to break up the old Colonial system, to discredit its principles, and to prepare the way for a more liberal commercial policy. Still a third factor making for the new policy was the Industrial Revolution, which introduced machine production and factories, and which was even more momentous in its consequences than the great political upheaval in France. The series of inventions by which the transformation was brought about culminated in the application of the steam engine as a motive power about 1785. The effect in changing the attitude of the manufacturer and the merchant toward the traditional trading policy is obvious. With superior methods of production they realized that they could supply better and cheaper goods than any other European country, and that, with unrestricted competition, they could command the markets of the world.

Industrial Development Previous to the Great Inventions. — The interval between the Revolution of 1688 and the era of machinery and steam was not without evidences of industrial progress. Much of this was due to the Huguenots, fleeing from France, who introduced new industries and improved methods. But industries and processes which came into conflict with those already established were bitterly opposed, while the difficulties of the protective system were illustrated by attempts of manufacturers to thrust the burden of taxation on trades other than their own. Furthermore, native workmen manifested stubborn hostility to the competition of the refugees and the introduction of labor-saving devices. Also, there was a growing friction between labor and capital; for, even before the age of machinery and factories, there were evidences of the rise of capitalism.

In a few towns, manufactures on a large scale had appeared, while, even in the country, capitalists had begun to supply the domestic workers with materials as well as with looms and stocking frames. The purer form of the domestic system survived longest in Yorkshire, where, as a rule, the spinners and weavers owned their instruments of production, provided their own wool and sold their cloth to traders in neighboring towns or at periodical markets and fairs. Elsewhere, however, troubles in the cloth trade indicated that differences were developing between the worker and the capitalistic owner, which, in spite of an early eighteenth-century proclamation against "lawless clubs" and a statute against combinations of workmen, went to the length of occasional strikes. The wool manufacturers steadily fought their rivals the linen manufacturers — chiefly strong in Ireland — as well as the importers and manufacturers of cotton.

The Cotton Industry. — Cotton products in the form of calicoes, cambrics and chintzes were originally brought from India, and became speedily popular because of their lightness and cheapness. Before the close of the century they began to be manufactured in England. Those interested in the woolen business, having become seriously alarmed, succeeded in arousing such popular opposition that those who wore cottons were attacked in the streets. Notwithstanding enactments prohibiting the importation of these fabrics, as well as the use of printed or dyed goods containing any cotton, there developed a public demand for such goods too strong to be resisted, the law was evaded, and an Act of 1736 allowed the manufacture of goods with a weft of cotton, provided that the warp was of linen yarn. The prohibition of pure cotton fabrics was not removed till 1774. As a matter of fact, the linen warp was essential, since the art of spinning a sufficiently tough cotton thread for the purpose was for a long time unknown. The chief center of the industry was in and about Manchester. This Lancashire district was peculiarly adapted for the industry; Liverpool furnished a convenient port for the importation of raw cotton from India, and, more particularly, from the American Colonies, which soon came to be the chief source of supply, while in the moist climate of the West Midlands the threads were less likely to break than in dryer regions.[1]

The Flying Shuttle and the Spinning Jenny. — Although it required several spinners to keep one weaver supplied, the first of the new inventions was an improvement in the hand loom. Hitherto, the shuttle which carried the weft had to be transferred from one hand

[1] Most important of all, after the introduction of steam, was the fact that this was the region of the coal and iron mines.

of the weaver to the other as it passed through the warp. Not only was the process slow and cumbersome, but, owing to the shortness of the human arm, breadths of cloth wider than three quarters of a yard had to be woven by two persons. This was remedied by a mechanical device, known as the flying shuttle, patented by John Kay in 1733, by which the shuttle was thrown from side to side along a board. As a result, the inequality between the weavers and the spinners was greater than ever. Kay and others busied themselves with the problem of improving the process of spinning; but no practical results were achieved until James Hargreaves, about 1764, invented the spinning jenny with which eight spindles could be worked in a row; moreover, the machine was so simple that a child could run it. Both Kay and Hargreaves were attacked by angry mobs of artisans, who furiously insisted that bread was being snatched from their mouths. Kay died in poverty on the Continent, and Hargreaves got only an inadequate return for his invention.

The Water Frame and the Beginning of the Factory System. — The spinning jenny was worked by hand. It had scarcely appeared when Richard Arkwright (1732–1792) put into practical operation a spinning machine which came to be known as the "water frame," though it was first worked by horse power. Aside from the more effective motive force, it had a further advantage of spinning a harder and firmer thread than Hargreaves' jenny. Since Arkwright was absolutely without mechanical training, he sought the aid of a clock-maker who showed him a model which he proceeded to appropriate. Obtaining his first patent in 1769, he at once erected a spinning mill, and in 1775 "patented a series of adaptations for performing on one machine the whole process of yarn manufacture." Unscrupulous in making use of the inventions of others, a forerunner of the modern captain of industry, he was energetic and resourceful in developing previous processes as well as in enlisting capital for his enterprises, and, more than any other single man, may be regarded as the founder of the factory system. With the invention, in 1779, of the spinning mule, combining the best features of the jenny and the water frame, the art of spinning still further outstripped the art of weaving, but the water loom of Edmund Cartwright — a machine which he patented in 1785 — restored the balance. The improved processes of spinning and weaving were first employed in the cotton manufacture and were only slowly adopted in the woolen industry.

The Pottery and Iron Industries. — The second half of the eighteenth century also marks an era in the pottery industry. Although the native product was serviceable and some of it not without beauty,

the finest work was done abroad until Josiah Wedgwood began to produce his wares. Having learned his trade, he opened works of his own in 1759, and ten years later established his famous manufacturing village of Etruria. He took out only one patent in his lifetime, relying upon the superiority of his product. Besides pottery for practical use, he produced works of exquisite art, and not only gained the English market but invaded the Continent, whither he exported five sixths of his wares. The progress of the iron manufacture was for a long time seriously hampered from the fact that charcoal was used in smelting, and there was a great outcry against depleting the forests for this purpose. With the employment of coke, in 1735, a slight development began. However, the first considerable step in advance came twenty-five years later with the introduction of blast furnaces supplied by pit coal, though it was only after the advent of steam engines to work the blast furnaces that substantial progress became evident.

Canal Transportation. — Improved facilities for transportation, due to the construction of canals, contributed vastly to the increasing industrial development. Canals with locks had long been in use on the Continent; but it was not till 1761 that the first one was opened in England. It connected the coal mines of the Duke of Bridgewater with Manchester, seven miles distant. While the funds were provided by the Duke, who devoted vast wealth and inexhaustible patience to the problem, the actual construction was due to the genius of his steward, James Brindley. Some of his engineering feats, such as carrying the canal over a river by an aqueduct thirty-nine feet high, made him seem a magician to his contemporaries. From Manchester he extended the canal to the Mersey, thus uniting by a water route the growing manufacturing center to Liverpool, destined to become the greatest of Atlantic ports. Brindley, before his death, had designed nearly four hundred miles of canal, and, before the introduction of railroads, 2600 miles had been constructed in England alone. In view of the miserable condition of the roads, the effect of the new system of transportation, which decreased the cost of carriage about seventy-five per cent, was incalculable. Markets were extended, and coal, iron, stone, and other heavy materials, could, for the first time, be utilized at considerable distances from the center of supply. The potteries profited greatly, for, in the case of this brittle ware, safety as well as cheapness had to be considered.

James Watt and the Steam Engine. — The final stage in the Industrial Revolution came with the introduction of the steam engine

for running machinery in mills[1] and factories. Although a steam engine was mentioned as early as 120 B.C., it was not till the very end of the seventeenth century that the expansion of steam was practically applied. In 1698 Thomas Savery patented a steam pump for raising water from mines. Soon, cheaper and more effective engines were in operation, but for three quarters of a century steam power was used only for pumping. It was the genius of James Watt (1736–1819) that transformed it into a genuine motive force. Watt, who was for a time instrument maker to the University of Glasgow, developed not only great manual dexterity but unusual scientific attainments and wide culture. With the conscious purpose of improving upon his predecessors,[2] he mastered French, Italian and German in order to familiarize himself with the work already done in other countries, and made a careful study of previous models. As a result, he developed the old device for pumping up and down into an impulse for circular motion. He took out his earliest patent in 1769. First associated with a Scotch ironmaster in the construction of improved steam engines, he joined himself, about 1773, with Matthew Boulton, who had a great manufacturing works at Soho near Birmingham. Though they had a long uphill fight in the face of mishaps, opposition of reactionaries and rivals, and infringements on patents, success finally came, and Watt opened the way for endless possibilities in production and distribution. In 1785 the first steam spinning machine in a cotton factory was set up, the example was soon followed in industries of all sorts, and the factory system, which was destined within a generation to make England the workshop of the world, had entered upon its modern phase.

The Effects of the Factory System. — The effects of the Industrial Revolution, for good or ill, were tremendous. One of the most immediate was that it gave the country resources to carry on another war with France, which resulted in the overthrow of Napoleon. Then it led to a complete transformation of conditions of laborers. Those who had hitherto lived in the country, spinning and weaving in their own cottages and generally cultivating a little farm at the same time, were turned into factory hands. Another result was the shifting of the chief area of population from the south and east to the midlands and north. Bare moorlands, dotted with small villages, began to swarm with life, crowded towns sprang up and the air was blackened with the smoke from countless chimneys. The moneyed classes had formerly been the landowners, the merchants and the financiers;

[1] The name "mill" is a curious survival from the days of water power.

[2] The old story about the tea-kettle is apparently a myth.

now a new class emerged — the capitalist manufacturer — destined to attain great social and political influence. Some were cultivated men, like Boulton and Wedgwood, others were grinding taskmasters. Much good came from multiplying the conveniences of life; moreover, the cheapening of processes of production stimulated consumption, and, in the long run, made for increased employment; but at first the displacement of old employments resulted in bitter suffering. Also, the overcrowding of towns with no sanitary provisions for increased numbers, as well as exacting supervision in the factories, was grievous to those brought up in fresh country air, and who, if they worked long and hard, had at least been their own masters. In one sense the riots provoked by the new inventions were blind and unreasoning; in another, they were justified; for they were provoked by real misery. The domination of capital, and the movements to resist it, antedate the factory, and the balance of advantage lay with the capitalist system; but the problem now became more acute. There were no laws to hinder the employment of child labor and no effective regulations against lowering wages, while increasingly strict measures were passed against combinations of workmen. Cessation of trade and labor regulation, of protection and special privileges, made for expansion of business, and developed a robust self-reliance, but, with the absolute and uncontrolled power which the great masters of industry enjoyed under the régime of *laissez-faire* that came to prevail for half a century or more, the strong throve and the weak were crowded to the wall. Private philanthropy and a few legislative measures in the interests of the worker began to manifest themselves in the interval; but little was done until the reform of Parliament gave the lesser folk a real voice in choosing their representatives.

Maritime Enterprise. — During the eighteenth century, English seamen were sailing in distant waters and exploring far-off lands. Many of them were chiefly bent on seizing the treasure and crippling the resources of Britain's enemies, some even were buccaneers, but they contributed much to foster the colonial and commercial supremacy of their country by extending her oversea possessions and opening new markets. In the early part of the period the West Indies and the African coast were still terrorized by the pirates who made war on British and foreign merchantmen alike. One of those sent out to suppresss these sea rovers was the notorious Captain Kidd, who turned buccaneer himself, and, after five years of nefarious activity, was captured and hanged in 1701. The greatest explorer of the century was Captain James Cook (1728–1779), who finished

"the main track of ocean discovery" and prepared the way for British dominion in Australia and New Zealand.

The New Agricultural Revolution. — There was, during the eighteenth century, a revolution in agriculture as well as in industry. Instead of turning the common lands and the small holdings into sheep pasture, which had been the primary aim of the enclosures of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and which had left five sixths of the land untouched, the guiding motive of the new movement was to redistribute and consolidate the scattered strips of arable land, with a view to effecting improvements in tillage which were impossible while the old system of common cultivation lasted. The defects of the old system of intermingled strips, common cultivation and common pasture, were many and serious. An enterprising farmer was seriously handicapped, because he could do nothing without the consent and coöperation of those associated with him, who might be incompetent and backward. Again, much time was consumed in going from one acre strip to another, and much land was wasted by footpaths, as well as by the balks which separated the various holdings. Then the absence of permanent walls, fences or hedges led to encroachment, to disputes and consequent litigation. Finally, the herding of cattle, belonging to all sorts of men, on the common pastures was a fruitful source of contagion. The new system was attended with many inestimable advantages; not only were the scattered strips consolidated and the common pastures partitioned, but much uncultivated land was enclosed, waste was reclaimed and more scientific farming was introduced, thus making it possible to meet the demands of the growing industrial population.

Pioneers in the Movement. — The chief pioneers of improvement were Jethro Tull, Lord Townshend, Robert Bakewell, and the famous traveler and agricultural expert, Arthur Young. Jethro Tull (1674–1740), who has been called "the greatest individual improver of the century," was more significant for the principles he established than for his own practical achievements. More effectively than any one before him he demonstrated the value of clover and turnips as a substitute for fallow. The increase of the turnip crop, he argued, made it possible to keep more stock, this meant more fertilizer for the soil, which thus enriched would, in turn, yield more crops for man and beast. Tull's more original contributions were the drill for planting seed, which prevented the waste from sowing broadcast, and the introduction of horse hoeing, which facilitated the work of keeping turnips and other growing crops free from weeds. His experiments were only carried to practical success by such great

landowners as Lord Townshend, in this period, and Coke of Holkam chiefly in the next. The great innovator in stock-breeding was Robert Bakewell. Up to his time, sheep had been raised mainly for wool, and cattle for draught purposes and milking. Thin sheep produced the finest wool, while long-legged, raw-boned cattle were best for drawing heavy burdens. To meet the growing demand for food, Bakewell set himself to breed fat types that would yield more mutton and beef. His efforts were crowned with amazing success, though more especially in the case of sheep. As a result of the impulse which he fostered the average size more than doubled.

Results of the Agricultural Revolution. — The results, however, were not effected without grave disturbances of the old rural order. In spite of nominal compensation, the small freeholders almost invariably lost by the redistribution. Indeed, from lack of capital to introduce the improvements required under the new system, a great majority of them, and of the lesser tenants as well, were extinguished. Much of the land was bought up by the great landlords or by wealthy merchants and manufacturers who either let it to large farmers on long leases or cultivated it themselves.[1] Some of the dispossessed yeomanry sank to the rank of laborers, others flocked to the growing industrial centers, while a few were fortunate enough to rise to the position of capitalist tenant farmers. The typical member of this new class was often a very grand person indeed. He kept great hospitality; he entertained his guests with French or Portuguese wines, his daughter played the piano and dressed in imitation of the nobility. In short, he became more prosperous than the old squire, and was as much above the freeholder as the manufacturer was above the artisan. The agricultural transformation, though not accomplished without petitions and even riots, was inevitable. The domestic system with its adjunct farming was on the road to extinction when the rise of the factories precipitated it.

Science and Scholarship. — While no discoveries in pure science were made during this period comparable to Newton's, or to those which the future had in store, the eighteenth century was a period of growing enlightenment and diffusion of knowledge and of patient research as well. This was manifest in many fields, among others, in chemistry, in biology, in geology, and in astronomy. Joseph Priestley discovered oxygen in 1774, a discovery which, through the work of Lavoisier in France, led to a complete reconstruction of chemical science. Benjamin Franklin, in 1754, sent to England an

[1] While a greater portion of this land was devoted to tillage, there were certain districts where cattle raising preponderated.

account of his famous experiment with the kite and key which "established the identity of thunder and lightning with the phenomena of electricity," and important work was done by contemporary Englishmen in the subject destined to be so big with possibilities. Among the few signs of advance in medicine was the introduction of inoculation, which became a general practice about 1740. In spite of its dangers it contributed much to stay the scourge of smallpox before the days of vaccination.

Richard Bentley (1662–1742), generally regarded as the greatest of England's classical scholars, marked an epoch in the science of critical investigation by introducing methods for detecting ancient forgeries. Then the second half of the century witnessed the rise of a new and important school of historians — the popular and literary. Foremost among them was the celebrated philosopher David Hume, whose *History of England* (1754–1761), though manifestly biased against the Puritans, and now largely superseded, is distinctive for its style and from the fact that it fashioned the views of the rank and file of readers for a century. But the greatest of all English historians was Edward Gibbon, whose *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (1776–1788), notwithstanding its unsympathetic treatment of Christianity and its ponderous style with monotonously recurring periods, remains among the world's classics.

Religion and Theology. — While not lacking in acrimonious controversies, the greater part of the century was marked by an absence of religious enthusiasm, by a tolerant, rational and materialistic spirit. It was an age of common sense in thought and conduct. The mass of the rural clergy were still poor and often ignorant. Among those with better incomes, the sporting parson, keen on hunting and hard drinking, was becoming a familiar figure, while many of the incumbents of London parishes were immersed in society and politics. Even the better sort preached cold, unimpassioned sermons, inculcating industry and moderation on prudential grounds, advocating charity and benevolence, to be sure, but shunning any approach to mysticism and asceticism. Another evidence of religious apathy was the decline of Nonconformity, which began to be remarked about the beginning of the second quarter of the century. A characteristic feature of the age was the rise of a school of English Deists who, while believing in a personal God, rejected most of the distinctive features of the Christian religion, such as revelation and the authority of the Church. These Deists are particularly notable for the influence which they exercised on the pre-revolutionary French thinkers and on the rise of Biblical criticism in Germany.

Philosophical Speculation. — The third Earl of Shaftesbury (1671–1713), whom his opponents have classed among the Deists, led a reaction against the ethical doctrines of his former master Locke, maintaining that the moral sense was innate and that morality was not something imposed by external authority. Bishop George Berkeley (1685–1753), who made war on the Deists, but more especially on materialism, was a more profound thinker than Locke. He rejected the reality of matter and taught that time and space have no existence except in the mind. In one sense, his teaching led to skepticism, in another, by making mind the ultimate reality he was the founder of modern idealism. The most acute thinker of the century, however, was David Hume. In 1739–1740 he published his *Treatise of the Human Understanding*, with the design of introducing the experimental method of reasoning into moral subjects, and most of his subsequent philosophical writings are developments of this early work. While his attacks on the prevailing systems of metaphysics and natural religion and his attempted reduction of all reasoning to a product of experience were destructive or sceptical, he prepared the way for constructive work in many fields. Though he owed much to Locke and Berkeley, he repaid the debt with usury, and even anticipated Kant in some of his metaphysical views.

The Wesleyan Methodists. — Meantime, earnest men had come to realize that a revival of spiritual life could not be brought about by the prudential ethics and rational orthodoxy inculcated by the divines of the period, that it was essential to make an appeal to the common people by means of the supernatural and the spiritual, by fervid, evangelical exhortation. This was achieved through the efforts of three Oxford men — John Wesley (1703–1791), Charles (1707–1788) his brother, and George Whitefield (1714–1770) — who, in 1729, joined a little band of students in an organization for mutual improvement nicknamed the "Methodists," and who brought about a tremendous revival, known as Wesleyanism, or Methodism, which ranks as one of the great movements of the century. John, the elder Wesley, was the real organizer, Charles was most famous for his hymns, many of which are in general use today; while Whitefield was the eloquent popular preacher. The truly vital moment came in 1739 when John was "converted," when he first felt that Christ had taken away his sins. Then followed the wonderful course of field preaching with appeals to men and women to seek salvation by throwing themselves on the mercy of the Saviour. Unhappily, a difference grew up between John Wesley and

Whitefield over the question of free grace, but although, in 1749, the two men became hopelessly estranged, each continued to pursue, in his own way, the work which they had begun in common. John was, curiously enough, a High Churchman who always regarded himself and his Society as members of the Establishment, and insisted that the Communion should not be administered except by ministers ordained according to the forms of the Church of England. It was not till 1795, four years after his death, that the Wesleyans or Methodists became an independent sect.[1]

There is much to criticize about Wesley and his followers — they were often self-righteous, extravagant, and superstitious — but they accomplished a great mission. They created a great sect, one of the greatest in the English-speaking world. They sought out the lowly and the vicious, and revealed to them "a new heaven and a new earth"; they restored their self-respect and kindled joyous hopes by assurance of forgiveness and salvation for all who repented of their sins. They diverted into channels of religious enthusiasm much of the discontent engendered by the suffering caused by the industrial changes and stimulated by the French Revolution. They contributed to awaken the Church from its torpor, and infused new religious enthusiasm into the old nonconformist bodies. Furthermore, they quickened the development of Sunday schools, and, directly or indirectly, the philanthropic and humanitarian movements, which led to prison reform and the abolition of the slave trade, and which were big with results in coming generations.

Adam Smith and the *Wealth of Nations*. — In 1776 Adam Smith published his *Wealth of Nations*, which opened an epoch in political economy. Even before the book appeared, advanced thinkers had attacked the most cherished of the mercantile theories, arguing that money was not wealth but only a measure of value; that it was a fallacious principle to hamper trade by prohibiting the export of specie, by fixing legal rates of interest, and by forcing foreign merchants to spend the proceeds of their sales in buying native goods. Already, too, the American Colonies had repudiated the exclusive trade policy pursued by Mother Country, and manufacturers had begun to strive against the old restrictions which shackled competition in the production and distribution of wares. Hence, Smith's admirers have gone altogether too far in hailing him as the creator of modern political economy; nevertheless, his work is of incalculable significance in first presenting, in a luminous, orderly and convincing form, views and

[1] Though already, in 1784, the foundations of the American Methodist Episcopal Church had been laid.

tendencies that were just beginning to take shape. The gist of his argument, which, within a generation, came to meet with general acceptance, was: that, under the mercantilist system, resting on balance of trade and the accumulation of specie, the interests of consumers and, indeed, of a great mass of producers, were sacrificed either to those of a small privileged group or to considerations of national power; that the individual should be left free to pursue gain in his own way; and that the greater the sum total of individuals who prospered, the greater would be the national wealth. He showed, too, that, in international trade, every nation must buy as well as sell, and that, in time of peace, such reciprocal trading was a benefit to all parties concerned. Some of his views and assumptions were erroneous; but, in the main, his teachings were adapted to the stage of development at which Great Britain had arrived.

Prose Writers of the Age of Anne. Addison and Steele. — Classicism, or pseudo-classicism, dominated English literature during the greater part of the century. Many eminent writers flourished, particularly during the reign of Anne, which is sometimes called the "Augustan Age" of English literature. While there was perfection within certain limits, it was a period of decided limitations. In contrast to the Elizabethan and Stuart periods, there was little sweep of imagination, little display of ornate diction or quaint and obscure learning. Conventions were carefully observed, and clearness and finish were sought rather than originality. Much of the writing reflects the artificiality of existing society, and is often social or political in its aim. In prose, the miscellaneous or social essay was highly perfected and the novel took its rise. Most famous among the essayists were Richard Steele and Joseph Addison, who in the *Tatler* (1709) and in the *Spectator* (1711), accomplished a notable work. By their comments on current events they have left a valuable record of the political and social conditions of their time; by their exhortations and by their example — for they sought to combine "morality with wit" — they made the coarseness and cynicism of the Restoration drama unfashionable; by gentle irony and by precept they inculcated more gracious standards in the art of living; by their reviews of British and foreign books they fostered knowledge and love of literature; and, finally, by the easy elegance of their style they furnished a model which affected the development of English prose writing. Addison, the chief creator of the immortal Sir Roger de Coverley, while he achieved his lasting fame as an essayist, also wrote verses, produced *Cato*, a tragedy which had a great vogue in his day, and was active as Whig pamphleteer. In contrast to Addison's placid, prosperous existence, "Dick" Steele,

who was likewise a stanch supporter of the Whig party, led a checkered career, being frequently involved in financial and other difficulties; but he was as lovable as he was irresponsible, and, in spite of his irregularities of conduct, remained through life a genial apostle of decorum, elegance, and good taste. He generously recognized the superior popularity of his collaborator and prided himself on starting him as an essayist, declaring that the world owed Addison to Steele. Unhappily, toward the end of Addison's life, the two friends got into a quarrel that was never healed.

Jonathan Swift (1667–1745). — The most striking literary figure, however, of the period of Anne and the early Georges was Jonathan Swift. Born in Dublin of English stock, he served, after a reckless term at Trinity College, for some years as a private secretary in England. Subsequently, he took holy orders, becoming Dean of St. Patrick's, Dublin, in 1713. His life was a series of disappointments which embittered a nature, not without noble, generous qualities, though curiously crossed with traits of meanness, of bullying and self-seeking. During his later life he was afflicted by a mental disorder, evidences of which had manifested themselves even earlier and which help to explain his peculiarities. Most of his writings were called forth by one or another current problem; with one exception they appeared anonymously; and *Gulliver's Travels* was the only one for which he received any pay. Famous among his early works is *The Tale of a Tub*, a remarkable satire on the theological conflicts between the Romanists, the Anglicans and the Dissenters. He also contributed several notable party pamphlets, first on the Whig and then on the Tory side, his *Conduct of the Allies* ranking as his greatest achievement in this field. Much of his political satire, violent as it is, was inspired by hatred of sham, injustice, and oppression rather than by party bias. His pleasantest work is his *Journal to Stella*, a daily account of his doings — during the brief period that he was a foremost figure in London society and politics — written to Esther Johnson, whom he is supposed to have secretly married. *Gulliver's Travels*, on account of its strange and diverting adventures, has always been a favorite children's book, a curious fact, since it is fundamentally a scathing satire on the weaknesses, follies, and vices of mankind, with particular reference to Swift's own day. For biting humor and unadorned simplicity and clearness — often veiling, however, a most subtle innuendo — his style has never been equaled. Coarse but virile, it ranges from the most comical grotesqueness to the sternest tragedy.

The Age of Dr. Johnson. — New characteristics are manifest in the early Georgian period. For one thing, it marks the beginning of the

Grub Street author,[1] who had to fight poverty and lived in a literary Bohemia. The era of literary patronage had practically passed and men of letters had to rely more and more on their own efforts, though it has been argued that the Grub Street tradition has been exaggerated, and that much of the suffering was due to the faults and peculiarities of individuals themselves. Yet the lot of struggling authors was hard enough in all conscience. Another distinctive feature of this period was the rise of the modern novel. The age, too, was stamped by the literary domination of Dr. Johnson, though, all-powerful as he was, he strove in vain to stem the tide of a growing romantic revolt against the prevailing classic traditions. Samuel Johnson (1709–1784) was the son of a bookseller. He was educated at Oxford, spent a few years as a provincial journalist and schoolmaster, and, in 1737, went to London. He had a long, hard fight to attain recognition and financial independence; but the experiences which he underwent taught him pity for the struggling members of his craft. His famous *Dictionary*, 1755, the fruit of seven years of toil, marked the turn in his fortunes. Undoubtedly the best of his many works is his *Lives of Poets*, which appeared in ten volumes between 1779 and 1781. Meanwhile, in 1763, he made the acquaintance of James Boswell, who later immortalized him in the most delightful biography in the English language. It is a mine of quotable sayings, and, moreover, since nothing was too minute for his biographer to record, Johnson is made to stand out before us in the midst of his circle as no man in the past. He was a unique personality. A talker of unusual gifts, though somewhat ponderous and domineering, he shone preëminently at the Literary Club, founded in 1764 by Sir Joshua Reynolds, and frequented by Burke, Goldsmith, Garrick, and Gibbon. As a writer, Johnson was a critic rather than an originator, with a style that is over elaborate, heavy, and — particularly in his early days — wordy, though always clear and correct. In spite of strong prejudices, he was generally sane in his judgments, an enemy to all shams, and one who set high moral standards in writing and conduct. All together, he was a man greater than what he wrote.

Defoe and the Rise of the Novel. — The novel, the rise of which dates from this period, is as dominating in modern English literature as was the drama in the Elizabethan and early Jacobean age. The name is derived from *novella*, the Italian word for a short prose story. The more realistic form descends from the Spanish picaresque[2] tales which relate adventures of roving scapegraces, selected as heroes. On

[1] So called from a poor street where many of the hack writers lived.

[2] From *picaro*, meaning literally "rogue."

the other hand, the knightly epic of the Middle Ages prepared the way for the later novel of romance. After Bunyan, Daniel Defoe (1661–1731) was the pioneer among modern realistic novelists. While he made no use of religious allegory and chose to picture sordid phases of life with the coarsest frankness, the edifying and moral endings of his books show that, like the author of *Pilgrim's Progress*, he aimed at reaching the Dissenters of the lower and middle classes. He spent the greater part of his life as a journalist and pamphleteer and was nearly sixty before he produced his first famous work of fiction, *Robinson Crusoe* (1719), a joy to succeeding generations of youth. In 1722 appeared the *Journal of the Plague Year*, a fictitious account of the visitation of 1666 put in the mouth of a pretended eye-witness. In his novels, of which *Moll Flanders* and *Colonel Jacque* are the best known, the incident is the main feature, and there is little direct attempt at characterization. Defoe was without imitators in his own lifetime. Samuel Richardson (1689–1761), a printer, who produced *Pamela*, *Clarissa Harlowe*, and *Sir Charles Grandison*, almost discarded adventure. In his novels, told in the form of letters, love appears as the main theme, there is considerable attempt at analysis of character, and contemporary life is minutely pictured. Richardson was the first of the sentimentalists and very didactic as well, aiming in his writing to inculcate virtue and correctness of behavior.

Fielding, Smollett, and Sterne. — The most delightful novelist of the century, unquestionably, was Henry Fielding (1707–1754). A man of good family, he went to Eton, studied law at Leyden and served as a London police magistrate, thus seeing many aspects of life. Beginning his literary career as a writer of plays, his first novel, *Joseph Andrews* (1742), was a parody on *Pamela*, the smug sentimentalism of which aroused his disgust, but, instead of telling his story in the form of letters, he reverted to Defoe's novel of incident, and developed his subject into a vivid picture of life in contemporary England, of the innkeepers, justices, parsons, people of fashion, and their footmen and ladies' maids. *Tom Jones* and *Amelia*, while primarily an elaboration of the same general type, have the added element of more involved plots. Fielding was intensely realistic. "I have writ little more than I have seen," he tells us; his characters and incidents are drawn from life, "and not intended to exceed it." His humor is broad; he is never analytic; he rails at pretense and selfishness, endowing some of his characters with a plentiful supply of these qualities; but by nature he was a wholesome optimist, without a touch of sourness or moroseness. Tobias Smollett (1721–1771), whose best-known books are *Roderick Random*, *Peregrine Pickle*, and *Humphrey*

Clinker, is another novelist of the picaresque type, who, from his experience as a ship's surgeon, added to our knowledge of the life of the period by his pictures of seafaring people and conditions on shipboard. He had an original and powerful gift for character drawing; but his work is marred by coarseness and his savageness in satire. Laurence Sterne (1713–1768) was a parson of a very unclerical sort. *Tristram Shandy* he wrote " with no clear design of what it was to turn out; on a design of shocking people and amusing myself." This was followed by the *Sentimental Journey*. Sterne's work is marked not only by the absence of plot, but by a conscious disregard of it; his humor is subtle, allusive, and insidious. He was a fantastic sentimentalist who pictured life, not as it actually existed, but for the sake of the moods it aroused in him. His real achievement was the creation of such a lovable whimsical character as Uncle Toby, one of the immortals of literature.

Goldsmith, Fanny Burney, and Horace Walpole. — Among the notable single novels of this period is the *Vicar of Wakefield* by Oliver Goldsmith (1728–1774), which Dr. Johnson sold for him in 1766, thus saving him from a debtor's prison. The peculiar charm in this work is due to the sweet, unworldly figure of Dr. Primrose, to its bits of exquisite nature-description and to its pervading sentimentalism which vaguely foreshadows the later romantic prose. Fanny Burney, or Madame D'Arblay (1752–1840), continued the realistic tradition, notably in *Evelina*. Like Richardson, she wrote with a moral aim; but her work is chiefly interesting for the light which it throws on the fashionable London life of the period. Horace Walpole (1717–1797), fourth Earl of Orford, famous as a collector, a virtuoso in art, as the author of spirited memoirs, and as the most fascinating letter writer in the English language, led a return to far-off, unreal things, to medieval romance, in his *Castle of Otranto*, 1764. This gave the impulse to a type of " Gothic " romance, many of which appeared during the half century following. Philip, Earl of Chesterfield (1694–1773) in his *Letters to His Son*, once so widely read, represents the hollow, superficial standards and worldly wisdom characteristic of the men of rank of his day.

The Poetry of Pope. — The unquestioned leader among the poets of the days of Anne and the first two Georges was Alexander Pope, (1688–1744) a man who attained perfection in a particular form of art by virtue of his very limitations. As a Roman Catholic he was cut off from the public service, and from various other forms of activity by deformity and weak health. He took up the heroic couplet of Dryden and gave to it an exquisite finish that surpassed even that of his mas-

ter. The oft-quoted *Essay on Man*, a subject suggested to him by Bolingbroke, was only a part of a contemplated series of poems intended to be a comprehensive survey of human nature. Not only was he unexcelled as a deft craftsman in versification, but he voiced the spirit of the age, its love of polished satire, its proneness for moral reflections, and its regard for external elegancies and artificial social conventions, together with its lack of imagination and imperfect appreciation of nature.

The Signs of the Romantic Revolt. — Although some excellent poems appeared during the interval between the passing of Pope and the wonderful revival which began toward the close of the century, these two generations can scarcely be called a poetic age. The most significant fact was the growth of a revolt against the reigning classicism — against the heroic couplet of Dryden and Pope, and against the tendency to deal with man chiefly in his conventional social environment. There was an effort to sound the deeper springs of the human soul, to reawaken reverence for the past and an enthusiasm for the beauties of nature. The *Seasons* of James Thomson is a manifestation of the new tendency, both in the subject which he chose and the blank verse in which he wrote it.[1] Then the *Night Thoughts* of Edward Young is marked by an introspective gloom, a communing of man with his own heart, quite foreign to the school of Pope. Thomas Gray (1716–1771) noted for his wide learning, also had an enthusiasm for natural scenery and Gothic architecture; yet, for all his romantic aspirations, he never wholly freed himself from the fetters of the times in which he lived. However, his *Elegy Written in a Country Churchyard* is one of the most perfect poems in the English language. A curious evidence of the reviving interest in the past were the literary forgeries of the precocious poet Thomas Chatterton (1752–1770) who, as a boy of twelve, attained access to the medieval charters of an old church in Bristol, and began to fabricate verses, and other pieces, which he tried to pass off as genuine works of antiquity. Unable to obtain recognition, he was reduced to despair and poverty, and poisoned himself in London when only eighteen. Another work, which had the profoundest effect in reviving an interest in old English poetry and which inspired the leaders of the dawning romantic movement, was the *Reliques of Ancient English Poetry*, published by Bishop Percy in 1765.

Drama and Music. — Though many of the so-called "Restoration" dramatists were writing at the beginning of the century, they were survivals of a past age. In the reign of Anne the theater began to give

[1] Among other poems he was also the author of the famous *Rule Britannia*.

way to Italian opera, which for a time had great vogue. This was due partly to the fashionable craving for novelty, partly to a real reaction of morals and taste, and partly to the activity of the Government in suppressing as "licentious," plays of a dangerous political complexion. To be sure, Colley Cibber (1671–1757) won considerable success, both as a playwright and as an actor, but the stage only came to its own again when David Garrick (1717–1779) began his wonderful career with the revival of Shakespeare in 1741. In 1774, Mrs. Sarah Siddons was the first of the famous Kemble family of actors to achieve recognition. About this time began to appear those comedies of Goldsmith and Sheridan which have been a source of delight ever since. The best-known are the *Good-Natured Man*, and *She Stoops to Conquer*, by Goldsmith, and *The Rivals*, *The School for Scandal*, and *The Critic*, by Sheridan. Meantime, the oratorio had gained an enduring hold on the English public. This was due to the genius of Handel (1685–1759) who, in 1712, took up his permanent residence in England, and developed choral music to a point which has never been excelled. From the appearance of *Saul*, in 1739, his success was permanent and lasting. Among his most famous productions are *The Messiah*, *Judas Maccabeus*, and *Joshua*.

"The Golden Age" of English Painting. — In painting there was, from the Revolution to the middle of the eighteenth century, an interval of darkness destined to be followed by a glorious dawn. The official portrait painters were mediocre foreigners and natives of even less talent; but, gradually, art societies were founded which did much for the encouragement of painting, particularly by founding competitive prizes and by lending their rooms for exhibitions. Meanwhile, in the painter and engraver William Hogarth (1697–1764), an artist of unique genius had arisen. Knowing his London as few have known it before or since, he portrayed its comedy and its tragedy with a rare gift of pictorial satire and a strong didactic sense. His first print, *The Taste of the Town*, appeared in 1724. Among his best-known works are: the *Harlot's* and the *Rake's Progresses*, and the *Marriage à la Mode*. During the second half of the century there flourished a wonderful triumvirate — Reynolds, Gainsborough, and Romney. Sir Joshua Reynolds, the first president of the Royal Academy (founded 1768), created a new epoch in portrait painting, and is generally regarded as the greatest master of the art which England has ever produced, excelling particularly in portraying the individuality of his subjects in feature and pose as well as in dress. Thomas Gainsborough, forced to rely on portrait work for a living, not only enriched the world with masterpieces, but was a pioneer in reproducing distinctively

English landscapes, while George Romney, although a less finished artist, had a keener sense of purely physical beauty and painted with more warm human feeling than either of his two great contemporaries.

Population. — The population of England in 1801, the date of the first official census, had reached nearly nine millions. This is very striking in comparison with the growth since the Restoration, when the country was estimated to contain about five million inhabitants. Equally striking was the shifting of the centers of density from the south and east to the midlands and the north. Thanks to abundant harvests and steadily increasing trade, the laboring classes seem to have been fairly well off during the first three quarters of the eighteenth century, or until the depression due to the Industrial and Agricultural Revolutions.

Evidences of Reforming Zeal. — Although the age, particularly before the Wesleyan revival, was a material one, when the majority were chiefly intent on business or pleasure, there are some isolated instances of philanthropy and reforming zeal. In 1736 an Act was passed to check the alarming increase of gin drinking among the lower classes. It led to so much smuggling and evasion that its principles were practically abandoned in 1743. Later regulation of the traffic, in 1751 and 1753, abated the evil only to a small degree. There were a few private philanthropists, lonely voices crying in the wilderness. Chief among them was James Oglethorpe who, in 1729, succeeded in procuring a parliamentary inquiry into prison conditions. Horrible abuses were exposed, a few regulations were made and some of the worst offenders were removed and punished; but no thoroughgoing reform was undertaken for over a century, and Oglethorpe turned his attention to the colony of Georgia, which he founded in 1733 as a refuge for poor debtors and oppressed foreign Protestants. Forty years later, John Howard took up the work which Oglethorpe had abandoned in discouragement. He was a Dissenter of independent means who became High Sheriff of Bedfordshire in 1773, and began his work of prison reform in the same year, apparently inspired by the knowledge, gained from his new office, that persons acquitted of guilt were kept in confinement on account of fees incurred while held for trial. He also discovered appalling conditions, resulting in a frightful prevalence of jail fever. As a result of his evidence presented before the House of Commons, two bills were passed in 1774: one providing for fixed salaries in place of jailers' fees, the other, for improving the prevailingly unsanitary conditions. These provisions were generally evaded; but he kept on unwearyingly, publishing his findings in a series of works on the *State of Prisons*, the first of which appeared in

1777. Reform came slowly, but his ceaseless efforts bore fruit in the following century.

Lawlessness and Crime. — Brutal punishments still continued. Prisoners hung in chains all over the land; after the '45, heads were seen rotting on Temple Bar, while by a law on the Statute-book till 1790, women guilty of murder or treason were to be publicly burnt, though in practice they were usually strangled first. Men convicted of treason were still cut down before they were half dead and their bowels burned before their eyes. The barbarous law of pressing to death prisoners who refused to plead before a jury was not repealed till 1772, though the practice was abandoned in 1735. The pillory was still a cruel and degrading spectacle, and men and women were still publicly whipped at the cart's tail. All that can be said is, that conditions were worse on the Continent, where torture and arbitrary imprisonment were still legal. Partly owing to the overseverity of the criminal code, but far more owing to the inadequate machinery for its enforcement, lawlessness prevailed to an alarming extent. Goods were landed by night at secluded inlets and bays, and loaded by armed bands on wagons and pack horses. Customs-house officers were overawed, or more often bribed, and we even hear of fifty or a hundred desperate men doing their work by day on the open beach. Highwaymen continued to ply their calling. The mail between London and Bristol was robbed five times in five successive weeks, and in 1757, a mail robbery took place within two miles of London; indeed, thefts, even open robbery, to say nothing of shoplifting and pocket-picking, occurred in the very heart of the City. Hanging and transportation proved of little avail. Jack Sheppard, who was hanged in 1724, and Dick Turpin, who followed him to the gallows in 1739, were regarded as heroes by many youths who were tempted to emulate their stirring adventurous careers.

Life in London. — In London, throughout the century, there was an epidemic of card-playing among the upper and middle classes which tended to displace reading and intelligent conversation. Lotteries and raffles were extremely popular, while fashionable folk gambled for stakes that were appalling; for example, Charles James Fox ran up debts amounting to a million dollars, most of which he lost at play. The standard of manners and conduct set by the essays of Addison and Steele declined under the first George, largely owing to the example set by him and his Court, but developed toward the middle of the century into the formal stilted type represented in Chesterfield's *Letters*. About 1750, Mrs. Montagu, following the lead of the late Queen Caroline, made an heroic effort to improve the intellectual

status of women by giving parties at which cards were excluded.[1] Mrs. Thrale was another woman of literary aspirations, and, at her parties, Burke and Dr. Johnson exercised their unequaled gifts in conversation. Great extravagancies of dress continued nearly through the century. Men were resplendent in coats, waistcoats and breeches of bright-hued silks, while women appeared with huge hoopskirts and amazing head dresses or pompadours a foot high. But the new inventions for producing woolen, linen and cotton clothes, as well as the effects of the American and French wars, were soon to change all this. In dress, as in agriculture, in industry, and in so many other ways, England had reached the threshold of the modern world.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

General Conditions. Traill, *Social England*, IV, V; Robertson, *England under the Hanoverians*, Introd., pt. I, ch. IV, pt. II, ch. IV. Leadam, *Political History*, ch. XXVIII. Hunt, *Political History*, ch. XIII. Lecky, *Eighteenth Century*, I, chs. I, II; II, ch. V; VII, ch. XXI.

Social and Industrial. J. Ashton, *Social Life in the Reign of Anne* (2 vols., 1882) and *Old Times* (1885); the latter made up of newspaper cuttings and caricatures. W. C. Sydney, *England and the English in the Eighteenth Century* (2 vols., 1891). E. S. Roscoe, *The English Scene in the Eighteenth Century* (1912). T. Wright, *England under the House of Hanover* (2 vols. 3d ed., 1852, reprinted as *Caricature History of the Georges*). Creighton, *History of Epidemics*. J. Howard, *The State of the Prisons* (4th ed., 1792). Warner, *Landmarks in English Industrial History* (1899), and E. P. Cheyney, *Industrial and Social History of England* (1901); both of these are good brief sketches. Cunningham, *English Industry and Commerce* (5th ed., 1912). Macpherson, *Annals of Commerce* (4 vols., 1805). J. R. Porter, *Progress of the Nation in its Various Social and Industrial Relations* (1851, new ed. F. Q. Hirst, 1911). A. Toynbee, *Lectures on the Industrial Revolution of the XVIIIth Century in England* (1896). S. Smiles, *Lives of Engineers* (3 vols., 1861–2). S. and B. Webb, *English Local Government, 1688–1835* (3 vols., 1906), valuable for local conditions. A. Young, *Tour in the Southern Counties* (4 vols., 1768); *Tour through the North* (4 vols., 1770); and *The Farmer's Tour through the East of England* (4 vols., 1771). Rogers, *Six Centuries of Work and Wages*, and *Agriculture and Prices*, V, VI. R. E. Prothero, *English Farming Past and Present* (1912). J. L. and Barbara Hammond, *The Town Labourer, 1760–1832* (1917) and *The Village Labourer* (1918). W. T. Jackman, *The Development of Transportation in Modern England* (2 vols., 1916); F. J. Foakes-Jackson, *Social Life in England, 1750–1850*. Usher is particularly full on the Industrial Revolution.

[1] She and her set gained the name of "blue stockings" from the fact that a prominent scholar attended some evening assemblies at Bath in grayish worsted stockings, instead of the black silk required for evening dress.

Learning and Literature. *Cambridge Modern History*, VI, chs. XXIII, XXIV; Moody and Lovett; and Taine. G. Saintsbury, *Short History of English Literature* (1898). *Cambridge History of Literature*, IX, X. T. S. Perry, *History of English Literature in the Eighteenth Century* (1883). E. Gosse, *Eighteenth Century Literature* (1898). L. Stephen, *English Thought in the Eighteenth Century* (2 vols., 2d ed., 1881), and *English Literature and Society in the Eighteenth Century* (1909). W. Raleigh, *The English Novel* (1894). C. B. Tinker, *The Salon and English Letters* (1915). Julia Patton, *The English Village: a Literary Study, 1750–1850* (1919). A. E. Dobbs, *Education and Social Movements, 1700–1850* (1919).

Religion. Wakeman, and Stoughton, above cited. Lecky, III, ch. VIII, for a discriminating account of Wesleyanism. For a full bibliography of religion in the eighteenth century, see *Cambridge Modern History*, VI, 851–857. J. W. Legg, *English Church Life from the Restoration to the Tractarian Movement* (1914).

Life in Scotland. Lecky, II, ch. VI. H. G. Graham, *Social Life in Scotland in the Eighteenth Century* (2 vols., 1900). For a full bibliography see P. H. Brown, III, 435–444. W. L. Mathieson, *The Awakening of Scotland*, 1747–1797 (1911), continues his *Scotland and the Union*.

CHAPTER XLV

THE YOUNGER PITT: THE NEW TORYISM AND ADMINISTRATIVE REFORM (1784–1793)

The Coalition Ministry (April–December, 1783). — Shelburne was forced out of office, 24 February, 1783, by a combination of Fox and North against their common political enemy; an "unnatural junction" which was defended by Fox on the ground that the country needed a "broad and stable administration," and that, with the close of the war and the end of George's personal rule, his chief grounds of difference with North were at an end. After a stubborn fight, the King, who had always hated Fox and who was infuriated at North for deserting his cause, was obliged to accept the Coalition Ministry. The Duke of Portland was made nominal head, but the real leaders were North and Fox, who became Secretaries of State. George's hostility to Fox was accentuated because of his intimacy with the Prince of Wales, a dissipated spendthrift, who warmly supported the Coalition, which the King was accustomed to designate as "my son's Ministry." Determined to get them out as speedily as possible, he nearly succeeded on the question of providing for the Prince's establishment; but the rock on which the Coalition foundered was a bill for the settlement of the government of India.

The State of India at the Close of the Seven Years' War, 1763. — Up to 1763, the English in India had been mainly occupied in overcoming European competitors. By that date they had practically excluded their rivals, and, henceforth, they were concerned chiefly with extending their sway over the native rulers and in establishing a satisfactory system of government. The Company, under its royal charter, renewed at intervals of about twenty years, consisted of a court of proprietors or stockholders and a board of directors. In India, where it was represented by the governors, or presidents, and their councils at Calcutta, Madras and Bombay, the affairs of the Company were sadly mismanaged during the period following its triumph over the French. The authority of the Moguls at Delhi

had faded almost to a shadow. Beside the viceroys of provinces and the rulers of tributary states, who exercised practically independent powers, there were the Maráthás, a group of tribes of Hindoo stock who, under the Peshwa of Poonah, were very strong in the western and central districts, though they too were somewhat on the decline.

North's Regulating Act (1773). — Suddenly, Madras was exposed to dangerous attacks from a native ruler on its western border. This menace, added to the absence of Clive — who, owing to ill-health, was never in India after 1760 except for a short interval from 1765–1767 — to dissensions at the India House and the general ineffectiveness of the Company's rule, caused its stock to drop to 60 per cent. At length, a famine in Bengal, in 1770, so reduced the Company's resources that it had to turn to the Government for help, as the result of which Lord North, in 1773, passed a measure known as the Regulating Act, providing, among other concessions, that a loan of £1,000,000 should be advanced and that bonded tea might be shipped to America free from English duties. In addition, the government in India was extensively reorganized: a supreme court was set up; the Governor of Bengal was made Governor-General, and was surrounded by a Council of four members named by Parliament.[1]

Warren Hastings (1732–1818). — Warren Hastings, the Governor of Bengal, who was appointed the first Governor-General, had come to India as a youth, and had worked his way up to the top by sheer force of ability. Frail in appearance, he was a masterful and even ruthless man. The situation which he had to face was one of enormous difficulty: the people were in the depths of distress, affairs had been grossly mismanaged, the English in India were intent on private gain, and the directors in London were at odds among themselves in everything except a consuming desire for dividends. Hastings brought order out of chaos; by improved methods of taxation and by careful economies, he increased the revenue, while at the same time he protected the people against plunderers. Unfortunately, however, the pressure of war and the financial demands of the Company led him to adopt too many high-handed and cruel measures. One of the earliest was to let to the Wazir of Oudh, for forty lacs of rupees,[2] a

[1] During the investigation leading up to the passage of this Act, a fire of criticism was directed against Clive, and a vote of censure was passed condemning many of his acts. Though it was declared that he "did at the same time render great and meritorious services to his country," he was so unstrung by the strain of the conflict that he died by his own hand, 22 November, 1774.

[2] A rupee is worth about fifty cents and there are a hundred thousand in a lac.

body of English troops to destroy his enemies the Afghans who had conquered Rohilcund on the northern border. Confronted, after he became Governor-General, first with a war against the Maráthás and then with another in the south, he resorted to acts of pitiless extortion. He required from the Raja of Benares, in addition to his annual tribute of £50,000, a war contribution and a contingent of troops. When the Raja, already suspected of disaffection, refused, Hastings promptly increased his tribute tenfold — a penalty out of all proportion to the offense — and displaced him by a successor pledged to obedience. Then he made a bargain with the young ruler of Oudh to deprive his mother and grandmother, the Begums or Princesses, of the lands and treasure of the late Wazir, and in order to accomplish his purpose subjected them to a siege, wasted their territories, and tortured and starved their chief ministers. The landed property was given to the reigning Prince, the treasure was appropriated for the Company. While it does not excuse the inhumanity and injustice of the acts for which he was responsible, it must be borne in mind that Hastings took nothing for himself,[1] that his sole aim was to secure resources to save the British dominion in India.

Fox's India Bill (1783). — Rumors of what was going on, and the hostility of the Rockingham Whigs to an official who was a product of North's Regulating Act, led to a parliamentary investigation in 1781. In the report which followed, the administration of the Company was condemned and the removal of Hastings recommended. The directors refused. Since they had the legal right so to do, the only way of effecting any reforms was by a complete reorganization. The struggle became acute in the autumn of 1783, when Fox introduced a famous measure — largely the work of Burke — to deprive the Company of its exclusive powers of government and to remedy the crying abuses in the existing system. There were really two bills, one transferring the Company's government of India to a body of seven commissioners nominated, in the first instance, by Parliament and holding office for four years;[2] the other dealing with administrative reforms; for example, the curtailing of monopolies and the extortion of presents. The first part of the arrangement was furiously attacked, both as a party measure and as a violation of vested rights, emphasis being laid on the fact that the first appointees were all supporters of Fox, who would be put in control of patronage worth £300,000 a year which would give them enormous influence. While reforming zeal

[1] Moreover, the treasure belonged not to the Begums but to the Prince, and the Begums were engaged in a conspiracy to root out the British power in India.

[2] Vacancies were to be filled by the Sovereign.

and politics were, to some degree, combined, the measure, however, was defeated, not on the ground of any of the objections which were raised, but by the King's hatred of the Ministers who framed it.

The Defeat of Fox's India Bill and the Overthrow of the Coalition (December, 1783). — After it had passed in the Commons, King George eagerly adopted a suggestion for blocking it in the Upper House. Lord Temple was given a paper to circulate among the peers stating that his Majesty would "consider as an enemy" whoever voted for the India Bill, and was empowered to use stronger words if he thought necessary. By this underhand means it was lost by nineteen votes. The Commons vainly protested in a resolution, declaring that "to report any opinion or pretended opinion of his Majesty upon any bill" pending in Parliament in order to influence votes, was "a high crime and misdemeanor."

Struggle with the Coalition (1783–1784). — On 18 December George dismissed the Ministry, and in his perplexity he turned to William Pitt to form a new one. Pitt was the second son of the Earl of Chatham, who had entered Parliament at the age of twenty-one, and Shelburne, in 1782, had paid a tribute to his name and talents by making him Chancellor of the Exchequer and Leader of the House of Commons. Now, when not yet twenty-five, with a remnant of the Chatham Whigs and a few Tories at his back, and discredited by the fact that he was the appointee of a Sovereign who had been guilty of a piece of unscrupulous tyranny, he had to face a hostile majority led by two veterans, one the most skillful party manager and the other the most adroit debater of the period. The battle which followed is perhaps the most remarkable in parliamentary history. At first it was an up-hill fight; motion after motion was carried against him; nevertheless, he refused to resign, nor was he keen on dissolving Parliament until he was sure of a majority in the elections. Fox, who led the Opposition, played into his hands by his violence and his blunders. His most fatal error was in insisting that the present Parliament should continue, with the aim of holding on to his majority, till 25 March, 1784, when he hoped, on the expiration of the Mutiny Bill, to paralyze the Administration by refusing to renew it. Pitt's patience, courage, calmness and disinterestedness gradually won him supporters until, when the Mutiny Bill came up for vote, it easily passed. Multitudes of addresses, from all parts of the country, now convinced Pitt that he could safely try the issue of a general election, in which he secured an overwhelming majority. Fox had offended the Whigs by his outspoken opposition to an appeal to the people during the preceding winter, and had alienated the Tories by his attacks on the

royal prerogative. Although the Whigs had been routed, it was a triumph not for the King but for Pitt. Henceforth the Prime Minister controlled the Government. While he came to call himself a Tory, he represented a new, more liberal form of Toryism, resting on popular more than on royal support.

The Westminster Scrutiny (1784–1785). — Pitt's triumph was marred by one ungenerous action — his treatment of his rival in the so-called "Westminster Scrutiny." The election was hotly contested, and all eyes had been centred upon it because of the candidacy of Fox, who was supported by numerous powerful friends, among them the Prince of Wales and the charming Duchess of Devonshire, accused of dispensing kisses in return for votes. Westminster returned two members, for which there were three candidates, including Fox. Fox, who started at the bottom of the list, had finally reached second place when the polls were closed at the end of forty days. The rejoicing of the Whigs was cut short when the defeated candidate demanded a scrutiny on the ground of fraudulent voting. As a matter of fact, there had been more votes cast than there were electors, so the High Bailiff was quite within his rights in granting the request, but he should have returned Fox's name on the day the writ was returnable, and left the final settlement to the committee of the Commons appointed under the Grenville Act. This he refused to do, and was supported by Pitt. Although the Bailiff was ordered to proceed with "all possible dispatch," months were wasted, and it was only after a vote had passed the Commons, ordering an immediate return, that Pitt gave way. Fox, who in the meantime had been sitting for a small Scotch borough, finally took his seat as a member for Westminster and ultimately secured £2,000 damages. Parliament sought to prevent such injustice for the future by a law providing that, henceforth, the polls were to be closed at the end of fifteen days, and that, though scrutinies might still be granted on demand, they must be stopped six days before the day on which the writs were returnable, *i.e.* about a month after the close of the polls.

William Pitt. — For an unbroken period of seventeen years Pitt was Prime Minister. As a parliamentary leader he had uncommon talents, which had been carefully developed; he spoke with convincing logic, and, when he chose, with extreme clearness; though owing to the need of parrying the searching questions of the Opposition, his utterances were most frequently those of the party manager rather than those of the impassioned orator. This was partly temperamental; he had plenty of courage and resourcefulness and a rare power of sensing the temper of the nation, but little imagination or fervid enthusiasm, nor

was he very original or profound. Absolutely indifferent to financial gain, his only personal vice was one all too common in those days — intemperate drinking of port, which contributed to his early death at the age of forty-seven; on the other hand, he was avaricious of power, more than once dropping a measure of which he approved for fear of weakening his position, though he had this excuse, that he ruled in a critical time, and may have honestly felt that the security of the State depended upon his tenure of office.

His Position and Problems. — His position in the spring of 1784 was one of unusual strength. Besides the prestige of his father's great name, he had won a dramatic fight against a combination which seemed well-nigh irresistible; the Whigs were hopelessly eclipsed and the extreme Tories were still discredited by the failure of the American War. He was pledged to no particular policy, he was supported by the moderate men of both parties, while the King, bound to him by gratitude, and realizing that the strength of the Government depended upon his popularity, was obliged to recognize him as Prime Minister in fact as well as in name. Pitt not only restored and firmly established the rule of the responsible Minister, but during his ascendancy practically did away with parliamentary corruption,[1] a work in which the second Rockingham Ministry had led the way. Almost the only questionable means to which Pitt resorted for strengthening his power was the lavish creation of peers, the result of which was to make the House of Lords a Tory stronghold and greatly to lower the average intelligence of that body: this was the price paid for breaking up the Whig oligarchy.

Pitt's India Bill (1784). — In the session of 1784, Pitt succeeded in carrying an India Bill which differed in some particulars from that which had wrecked the Coalition. It provided for a Board of Control consisting of six members appointed by the King. While the Company was left in the control of patronage, its civil and military administration was put under the superintendence of the new Board. The Governor-General, together with the presidents and councils in India, was chosen by the Company, subject to the royal approval, and the King had the power of removal at any time. With the exception of a few amendments, Pitt's arrangement, with its system of dual control, continued in force until 1858.

The State of the Finances. — Pitt's greatest services were in the field of financial reform, where the situation which he had to face demanded

[1] For example, he did away with the abuse of distributing contracts for loans and lotteries to favored supporters of the Government, and awarded them to the lowest bidder.

uncommon courage and ability. The public credit was at a low ebb. Three per cents [1] stood at 56 or 57; about £14,000,000 of the debt was unfunded, while outstanding bills circulated at a discount of 15 to 20 per cent. Commerce had suffered from the loss of colonial trade, and the customs revenues were greatly diminished owing to wholesale and shameless smuggling. There were many other ways, too, by which the State lost money. For example, grave abuses existed in the department of public accounts: there were four Treasurers of the Navy whose accounts had never been settled since they left office, and one Treasurer had retained public moneys in his hand for forty years. The auditors left all business to clerks who were powerless, even if they tried, to enforce any regulations. Moreover, the customs were in a most confused and complicated state; there were sixty-eight separate groups of duties, while many different duties were imposed on the same article — in one case fourteen — appropriated to pay interest on different branches of the National Debt.

Pitt's Reforms. — Pitt set himself to simplify and purify this chaos of confusion and corruption, to increase the revenue, and to put the finances on a sound basis. He began, in 1784 and 1785, by funding the unfunded debt. Also he framed effective measures against smuggling. By the "Hovering Act" he provided for the confiscation of suspected vessels found hovering within four leagues of the coast; furthermore, he lessened the temptation to smuggle by reducing many duties that were too high, making good the loss by imposing other taxes more equally distributed and less liable to evasion. To guard against further misuse of public moneys he provided that the Treasurers of the Navy should close their accounts every year. In place of the old inefficient auditors he set up a new commission, and appointed another body to inquire into fees and perquisites of public officers. Doubtless his greatest reform in financial administration, and one of the most important in English commercial history, was his consolidation of the different branches of the customs and excise in 1787. First he abolished the existing duties on different articles, substituting in each case a single duty, usually equal to the former total, after which he brought the whole into a single Consolidated Fund on which the public debt was secured. This measure, so simple in theory, proved so complicated in practice that it required no less than three thousand resolutions to carry it into effect. In common with a few

[1] Government stocks paying 3 per cent interest. They were called "consols" because the interest was paid from the Consolidated Fund. Three of the great funds, the South Sea, the Aggregate, and the General Funds had been consolidated in 1751.

advanced thinkers of the time Pitt saw inestimable advantages of unrestricted commercial intercourse between Great Britain and her neighbors, and in 1786 he succeeded, against strenuous opposition, in carrying through a commercial union with France which lasted till the opening of the new French War in 1793.

Pitt's Sinking Fund (1787). — Of all Pitt's financial measures his Sinking Fund doubtless made the greatest impression upon contemporaries. His motive was most praiseworthy. With the return of peace he felt that steps should be taken to redeem at least a portion of the Public Debt in order that posterity might not be so heavily burdened. Partly owing to his wise administration and partly to the growth of commerce and manufactures, he found himself with a surplus of £900,000 at the end of 1786. By a slight increase of taxation he determined to bring this amount up to £1,000,000 and to raise a like sum every year for the reduction of the debt. Instead of being paid out at once, this annual surplus was to form a Sinking Fund. His scheme — suggested by Dr. Price, a Nonconformist minister — was in substance to set aside an annual sum for the purchase of stock, the interest of which was to be employed in buying more stock, and so on. Thus the fund was to go on accumulating at compound interest and was ultimately to be applied toward the extinguishing of the debt. The principle worked admirably so long as there was a surplus; but the difficulty arose when money was borrowed to maintain and increase the Sinking Fund. This happened in 1792, when it was provided that one per cent of every loan contracted should be applied to this object. Sometimes money was borrowed at a higher rate of interest than the old debt bore or the Sinking Fund earned. Even if the rate was the same, there was a loss due to the expense of the transaction. It was estimated that before the Sinking Fund was done away with, in 1823, it had cost the country about £20,000,000.

Pitt's Strength and Achievements. His Limitations. — A survey of Pitt's activity as Prime Minister, during these years, will go to show that he did his greatest work as a reformer of administrative detail, especially in finance. It is true that he made use of the ideas of others; but he showed the capacity of the statesman in carrying them into effect. In matters of larger policy he was less successful, as his later management of the Sinking Fund indicated. In other fields of domestic policy, for example, parliamentary reform,[1] aboli-

[1] He introduced three bills for parliamentary reform — for the purpose of transferring members from decayed boroughs to counties and populous towns and for extending the right to vote — but after the third bill was defeated, in 1785, he never brought up the subject again.

tion of the slave trade, religious toleration and concessions to Ireland, his views were generally wise and liberal. Nevertheless, he accomplished almost nothing to carry them into effect. He had had ideals which his great predecessor Walpole had apparently scorned, but, like him, was over-ready to drop measures which threatened such opposition as to endanger his ascendancy, though it should be borne in mind that for some years his personal following was small, that the Crown party might be diverted, if ever the stubborn adroit King undertook once more to take the bit in his teeth, and that, by the time he had secured a dependable majority, the French Revolution broke out, followed by a long war which put a decisive check on progressive measures for a generation.

The African Slave Trade. — His attitude on the abolition of the African slave trade, while not beyond criticism, was more praiseworthy than in the case of many other reforms. In 1787 a society was formed for the suppression of this horrible traffic, whereupon Pitt appointed a committee to investigate the charges of cruelty alleged against those engaged in the transportation of slaves. Shocking disclosures resulted. It was found that the unfortunates were packed tightly on the lower decks and in dark stuffy holds, that they were supplied only with bread and water and very scantily at that, and were flogged at frequent intervals to give them sufficient exercise to keep them alive. Pitt introduced the bill to suppress the trade in 1788; in the following year he joined Fox and Burke in supporting another, and in 1792 he made a speech on the subject which was perhaps the greatest effort he ever delivered. Powerful interests, however, with which the King was allied, stood in the way, and it remained for Fox to draft the bill which finally abolished the slave trade in 1807.

Impeachment of Warren Hastings (1786–1795). — In February, 1785, Warren Hastings returned from India. While the King and the Court party received him with great favor, the Opposition straightway proceeded to attack him as a means of dealing a blow at the Government. Their hostility was whetted by the opportunity of putting Pitt in a dilemma. If he supported their charges he ran the chance of breaking with the King and his following, if he refused he might properly be accused of seeking to cover up grave scandals. As a result, charges preparatory to an impeachment were framed and put to vote in the Commons. The first, relating to the Rohilla War, was dismissed. The second, dealing with the fine imposed on the Rájá of Benares, was passed, largely owing to Pitt, who, in this case grudgingly sustained by the King, rose superior to party considerations and declared that while the Rájá was bound to furnish money and men, the fine

imposed upon him was "exorbitant, unjust, and tyrannical." The third charge, based on the treatment of the Begums of Oudh, was then easily carried. Burke presented the impeachment before the Lords, 11 May, 1786, but the trial did not begin till 13 February, 1788, and dragged on for seven years. The accusers, especially Burke, spoke with wondrous eloquence, but marred their case by violence and abuse. Finally it was established that Hastings had been confronted by unusual problems, that, while he had been guilty of acts of cruelty and extortion, he had done nothing for his own enrichment, and that he had ruled with effectiveness and success; consequently, in 1795, he was acquitted on every count. The trial cost him £70,000 which was subsequently repaid to him.

The King's Insanity and the Regency Question (1788). — Meantime, a crisis had occurred in which Pitt once more proved his superiority over Fox as a parliamentary tactician. On 5 November, 1788, the King was attacked by a fit of insanity which for a while was regarded as incurable. A Regency seemed inevitable. Though the Prince was far from fit to rule the country, every one agreed that the office of Regent belonged to him. That meant the return of the Opposition to power under Fox, his political tutor and boon companion. On a chance that the King might recover, Pitt postponed the meeting of Parliament by successive adjournments, but only for a time; much as he loved power, he was prepared to lay down office; but he was determined that the Prince should only be appointed Regent with limited authority defined by Parliament. Fox and his party, anxious for a free hand especially in patronage, insisted that Parliament had no right to impose limitations. This was absolutely inconsistent with all of Fox's political principles and a great tactical error. Pitt, when he heard him declare his position, slapped his leg and cried: "I'll unwhig the gentleman for the rest of his life." Placards were posted in the streets with the legend: "Fox for the Prince's prerogative, and Pitt for the privileges of Parliament and the liberties of the nation."

The Regency Bill (1788–1789). **The King's Recovery.** — Finally, a bill was drawn up conferring the Regency upon the Prince of Wales and defining the limitations to be imposed upon him. With rare disinterestedness, Pitt agreed that the Regent should have full power of dismissing his Ministers and dissolving Parliament; but, by the Bill, he was bound by various rigid restrictions. He could confer no peerages save on members of the royal family; he could grant no offices or pensions not terminable at the King's pleasure, except in unavoidable cases, such as judgeships; he could not give away any part of the

King's estate, real or personal; and he was to have nothing to do with the care of the King's person or the management of the royal household, which was intrusted to the Queen. The Prince, with the greatest reluctance, accepted the terms, on condition that they should not be binding for more than three years. The measure passed the Commons and had already reached the committee stage in the Lords, when it was stopped by the news that the King was on the road to recovery. Pitt, by the tact and good judgment which he had shown throughout the crisis, strengthened his position with King, Parliament, and people, while Fox, by his woeful blunders in striking at the authority of Parliament and in attempting to overthrow a Ministry possessing the popular confidence, greatly diminished the already waning influence of his party.

The French Revolution and Its Effect on England. — Not long after, a tremendous upheaval began in France which was destined to exercise a profound influence upon the history of England. The spirit of liberty, of equality, of opposition to established institutions, and hostility to class privileges which underlay all the French revolutionary excesses, proved ultimately a potent factor in helping to create the modern English democratic State; but the immediate effect was to check the progress of reform for years to come. The Revolution produced a terror of innovation not only in the minds of conservatives but even of moderate men, and it plunged the country into a war which absorbed its chief wealth and energy from 1793 to 1815. The Tory party, which carried this war to a triumphant conclusion, was securely intrenched in power for more than a decade after its close. Meantime, England was going through a great Industrial Revolution due to the introduction of the factory system. Acute social problems were pressing for solution, problems resulting from overpopulation, and from poverty caused by the war and by the readjustment of economic conditions. With these problems, and with the difficult question of the relations with Ireland, the dominant party, primarily concerned with preserving its class privileges, had little understanding or sympathy. The Whigs, who, since the break-up of their aristocratic cliques, had again become the party of progress, were weakened by the secession of their more moderate members, and discredited by the revolutionary principles of the extremists and by the critical and anti-national attitude which they assumed toward the French war.

The Reception of the Revolution in England. — The news of the events in France leading up to and immediately following the outbreak of the Revolution — the summoning of the Estates General,

5 May, 1789, the formation of the Constituent Assembly[1] and the oath of the Third Estate not to separate until they had given their country a Constitution, the storming of the Bastille, 14 July, the abolition of feudal privileges and titles, and the Declaration of the Rights of Man, 27 August — was received in England with general satisfaction. Pitt thought with the majority that the overthrow of the old arbitrary and corrupt régime would be followed by the establishment of orderly constitutional government. Moreover, with Britain's old enemy thus occupied, he hoped for a period of peace and light taxes. Burke, however, took an opposite view from the start. He foresaw that the frenzy which had manifested itself in mob violence would never stop with moderate reforms, that the French example might be so contagious as to endanger the stability of existing institutions in England and other European countries. The attitude of Fox was quite different from that of either Pitt or Burke. While regretting the attending bloodshed, he rejoiced at every step in the progress of the Revolution. Events proved that Burke's fears were only too well founded. The upheaval in France resulted not in constitutional government but in anarchy, followed by a military despotism and a series of aggressive wars in which almost every State in Europe was shorn of territory or had its government overthrown. The ultimate results of the Revolutionary movement, however, went far to justify Fox's admiration of its fundamental principles. The democratic spirit, if not widespread, was at first very active in England. A few ardent spirits began to dream of a "glorious prospect for mankind" with an end to all civil and ecclesiastical tyranny, and, 9 November, 1789, the Revolution Society — a little group organized to commemorate the Revolution of 1688 — met and sent a congratulatory address to the National Assembly, a proceeding which called forth Burke's celebrated *Reflections on the French Revolution.* Other clubs sprang up in many of the larger towns and the press was busy turning out pamphlets and libels expressing advanced views. Nevertheless, the spirit of disaffection made little progress. The King had recovered the popularity lost by the failure of the American War, his illness had called forth increased loyalty, and the control of affairs was in the hands of a Prime Minister secure in the public confidence.

The Breach between Burke and Fox. The Split in the Whig Ranks (1791). — Burke's *Reflections* was answered by Thomas Paine in his

[1] The various Revolutionary Governments were: the National or Constituent Assembly (1789–1791); the Legislative Assembly (1791–1792); the National Convention (1792–1795); the Directory (1795–1799); the Consulate (1799–1804); and the Empire under Napoleon (1804–1815).

Rights of Man, a rough stirring appeal to the masses, and by James Mackintosh in his more polished *Vindiciæ Gallicæ;* but they failed to check the steadily increasing conservatism of the majority. Fox and Burke were growing more estranged, owing to their opposing views on the French Revolution, and the final break came in the spring of 1791. Previous differences of opinion had never interrupted Burke's long and intimate friendship with his old political disciple. That friendship he now declared he was prepared to sacrifice, while Fox, moved even to tears, protested without avail. The break resulted in more than a personal estrangement between Fox and Burke, it marked another split in the ranks of the Whig party. At first Burke, denounced as a deserter, stood almost alone; within a year, however, the majority came round to his side, while the following of Fox shrank to the "weakest and most discredited opposition" England has ever known. In his *Appeal from the Old to the New Whigs* and in his private correspondence Burke defended the consistency of his attitude, distinguishing, with great effect, the Revolution of 1688 and the American Revolution from the movement in France, and making a powerful plea for the party "attached to the ancient tried usages of the Kingdom" and to security of property. He was hot for intervention, on the express condition, however, that such intervention should be solely for the purpose of restoring order in France and with no idea of territorial aggrandizement or setting up despotism anew. But he failed to realize the futility of attempting to suppress permanently the new ideas to which the French Revolution had given birth, or to gage accurately the selfish conflicting aims of the European Powers.

Pitt's Foreign Policy (1783–1788). The Triple Alliance (1788). — Pitt was more cautious, and his policy, though the logic of events forced him later to depart from it, was simple and consistent — to avoid interfering directly or indirectly in the affairs of France. The British had emerged from the American War without a friend on the Continent, and during the decade which had elapsed since he came to power, the Premier had managed to keep clear of European wars. Prussia, who was equally isolated, seemed to offer the only prospect of alliance; but Frederick the Great was still unfriendly. His death, 17 November, 1786, paved the way for the closer relations between Prussia and England. Shortly after, an occasion arose which led to a close alliance. France allied with the Dutch republicans and drove the Stadtholder from power. When the dominant party went so far as to arrest the Princess of Orange and refused to grant satisfaction for the insult, Frederick William II,[1] who was her brother, determined

[1] He was King of Prussia from 1786 to 1797.

to take action. He sent an army into Holland, England made active preparations to assist him in the interests of the Orange Party, France backed out, and a Triple Alliance was formed, in 1788, between Great Britain, Prussia, and Dutch Orange Party for mutual defense and the maintenance of peace in Europe. The British had succeeded in withdrawing from their isolation.[1]

Pitt's Effort to Avoid Intervention in French Affairs. — For a time Pitt held aloof from any attempt to intervene in France. In spite of his belligerent attitude towards Russia — whose designs against Poland [2] and the Turkish territory along the northern shores of the Black Sea he feared and was unable to check — he was really anxious for peace, to develop his commercial and financial reforms, to keep down taxes and to reduce the debt. Moreover, he thought that Burke exaggerated the danger and even the importance of the French Revolution. It was clear that the majority of Englishmen were opposed to Revolutionary doctrines. However, it soon became apparent that the French Revolutionists, far from confining themselves to their own country, were determined to spread their gospel of freedom throughout Europe. In England, in spite of the prevailing hostility to Revolutionary ideas, various societies were formed to promulgate them. In addition to the Revolution Society [3] there were the Society for Constitutional Information and the London Correspondence Society, all of whom were in communication with the Jacobins in Paris. The London Society was the most violent of all. Inflammatory speeches were made at its meetings, and under its auspices the most violent pamphlets and broadsides were circulated. In spite of the opposition of Fox and the other extreme Whigs, a royal proclamation against seditious writings was issued, 21 May, 1792, and proved effective in checking the Revolutionary propaganda.

French Aggressions in the Netherlands, 1792. — Meantime, events were moving rapidly on the Continent. Marie Antoinette, the Queen of Louis XVI, and an Austrian princess, had gone to the length of applying to the Emperor for aid; but the initial step was taken by France, who declared war on Austria, 20 April. In August, Louis XVI was deposed and he and his Queen imprisoned. The English

[1] The support of his new allies, as well as the hostility of revolutionary France to an effete monarchy, enabled Pitt to block Spain in an attempt to oust the British from a trading and fishing settlement which they had established on an island in Nootka Sound off Vancouver, 1789–1790.

[2] There were three partitions of Poland between Russia, Austria, and Prussia, in 1772, 1793, and 1795 respectively.

[3] The Society of Friends of the People was chiefly interested in parliamentary reform and held aloof from the French Revolutionary party.

ambassador was recalled forthwith, on the ground that the Sovereign to whom he was accredited reigned no more, though the French representative remained in London without official status. Then came the September massacres in Paris, which filled even Fox with horror. About the same time, the Austrians, and the Prussians who had allied with them, crossed the frontier. Frederick William II had declared: "The comedy will not last long . . . the army of advocates will soon be annihilated; we shall be home before autumn"; but the invaders were repulsed at Valmy, 21 September, and before the end of October were forced to withdraw from France. The French commander next turned to the Netherlands, where he defeated the Austrians, 6 November, after which he overran the whole country. Territorial aggression and the spread of Republican ideas went abroad hand in hand. In Holland the old Republican party raised its head again, whereupon the States General appealed to Great Britain and received assurances that in case of need they would be protected.

The Opening of the Scheldt, and the Decrees of 19 November and 15 December, 1792. — On 16 November, the French declared the river Scheldt open to navigation. This was at once a violation of the treaty rights[1] of the Dutch and a defiance of Great Britain, who was bound to protect them. The triumphant Revolutionists, who had also annexed Savoy and Nice, declared in their exultation that they would "break all the Cabinets of Europe." They held out hopes to the English societies with whom they corresponded that a republic would soon be set up in Great Britain, and sent emissaries to stir up disaffection in different parts of the country. It was an especially favorable time. Owing to a bad harvest the price of wheat was high, and the poor, particularly among the manufacturing classes, were suffering for food. Riots broke out, accompanied by frequent cries of "No excise!" "No King!" On 19 November, the National Convention issued a decree offering to assist, even by force of arms, all nations aspiring to liberty. In view of the aggressions in the Netherlands and of this open invitation to revolt, the English Government began to prepare for a possible conflict, though Pitt still hoped to maintain peace. A proclamation was issued 1 December, calling out the militia, and when Parliament assembled, the Government, which had already taken steps to increase the army and navy, introduced an Alien Bill that became law in January, 1793. It placed all foreigners under surveillance, prohibited them from bringing arms or ammunition into the country, and authorized the Government, if necessary, to expel them. Fox declared that the danger was exaggerated, resisted

[1] It had been closed to all except the Dutch by the Peace of Münster in 1648.

all restrictive measures, and advised the recognition of the French Republic, which had been declared, 22 September. But he was little heeded, for the designs of the dominant Revolutionary party grew steadily more menacing. They began to treat the Austrian Netherlands as a part of France and to introduce democracy. On 15 December, 1792, the National Assembly issued another decree declaring that in every country occupied by French armies the commander should proclaim the sovereignty of the people and suppress the existing system of government, treating as enemies all who opposed them.

The Outbreak of War with France (1793).—As late as 31 December, 1792, the British Foreign Secretary declared that his Majesty still desired peace, but a peace "consistent with interests and dignity of his own dominions, and with the general security of Europe." All the while the French were preparing to invade Holland, though they were full of soothing assurances to the English that they did not mean to hold the Netherlands in permanent subjection, and that their decree 19 November was meant to apply only to countries where the desire of the people for a Republican government was manifestly expressed. However, in a vote of 13 January which was really an ultimatum, they refused to reverse their action in opening the Scheldt; they insisted that they should judge when to interfere in behalf of insurgents in other countries; and declined to set a definite time for their withdrawal from the Netherlands. The Foreign Secretary sent a haughty reply; but negotiations were still dragging on when the execution of Louis XVI, 21 January, sent a shudder of horror through England, and the very people in the streets cried: "War with France!" The French Minister, who had been informally representing the Republic, was ordered to leave the country, and, 1 February, France declared war on Great Britain and Holland. Though the declaration came from France, Pitt had come to realize that the conflict was inevitable and had virtually closed the negotiations by refusing to listen to more assurances and by the abrupt dismissal of the Republican representative. The active promulgation of Revolutionary doctrines taken alone would not have dragged him from his neutral attitude; and, unlike Burke and the Prussian and Austrian rulers, he had no desire to undertake a crusade for the restoration of Monarchy in France. It was the violation of the treaties relating to the Scheldt, which threatened the security of the public law of Europe, the occupation and threatened annexation of the Austrian Netherlands, and the danger of an invasion of Holland that finally determined his attitude.[1] In his opinion it

[1] France in possession of the Low Countries with Antwerp as a port would have been a grave menace to British maritime supremacy.

would be a "very short war and certainly ended in one or two campaigns." Burke predicted that it would be a "long war and a dangerous war." As a matter of fact, with one brief lull, it lasted for over twenty years.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

See Chapter XLVII below.

CHAPTER XLVI

THE GREAT WAR WITH FRANCE TO THE PEACE OF AMIENS (1793–1802)

General Features of the War. — The outbreak of the war in 1793 found England unprepared to undertake military operations on a large scale. In the year 1792 the British army numbered only 17,300 men, while, at the time of the French declaration, it had only been increased by 10,000. Instead of strengthening it at once, Pitt relied on small expeditions sent out to coöperate with the French royalists — a plan which proved futile; for a people, however disaffected, seldom coöperate cordially with a foreign invader. It was not till new methods were employed after Pitt's death that the British army achieved effective results. Another source of weakness, in the beginning, arose from the fact that the first generals were chosen because of their family connections rather than for their military ability. In striking contrast, the British navy showed, from the start, the superiority for which it had been famed, and under skilled and heroic commanders a steady succession of victories resulted. Nevertheless, while the British navy effected much by blockading French ports, severing her fleets from the sea, and capturing her colonies, the final issue had to be fought on land. A significant factor was the ultimate transformation in the character of the war. Great Britain's Continental allies in the beginning were not peoples but absolute monarchs concerned in maintaining their power and preserving or extending their boundaries. Then the French Government changed from a Republic bent on a general crusade for liberty to a military despotism aiming primarily at territorial aggrandizement. The result was to produce a great national reawakening in Spain, Russia, and Prussia. Only after that happened was France struck down in her victorious career. Meantime, with her fleets and her subsidies, Great Britain had saved Europe by sustaining her allies until they were able to turn and overthrow their aggressor.

The First Coalition (1793–1797). — The war opened with a period of hard times and a money stringency; in spite of this unpromising

state of affairs the Government went on effectively with its preparations for war. Alliances were formed with Holland, Prussia, and Austria; Russia, whose troops were occupied in Poland, agreed to lend her fleet to assist the British in preventing neutrals from supplying the French with food; smaller States were secured by treaties and subsidies, and troops were hired from Hanover and Hesse. This First Coalition, as it came to be called, began with a series of decided successes. The French were driven out of the Netherlands and defeated in the Rhine country, while a British fleet, assisted by Spain, who joined the Coalition in May, captured the important naval station of Toulon. The prospect looked dark enough for France. On the borders her troops were unruly, her generals were inefficient, and her War Ministers proved incompetent. Most of the leading cities outside Paris were in revolt, while a formidable insurrection had broken out in the Vendée. The Allies, with 300,000 men posted along the frontier from the Alps to the Netherland sea coast, might by a sudden concerted movement have taken the French capital, but their troops were kept inactive while they quarreled about the partition of territory much of which was not yet in their possession. The crisis inspired the French to heroic efforts. In August they ordered a universal conscription, and under a new War Minister, Carnot, who proved a genius in the work, the raw recruits were amalgamated with the regulars into an effective army. They recovered ground in the Netherlands as well as in the Rhine country, they crushed and scattered the Vendéans and also recovered Toulon, in which achievement a young Corsican artillery officer, Napoleon Bonaparte, first came into military prominence.

Pitt Becomes a Reactionary. — The turn of the tide, due to the patriotic enthusiasm of the French and the selfish division of the Allies, was accompanied by the "Reign of Terror" in France — a carnival of bloodshed lasting from early in 1793 to the summer of 1794, one result of which was to convince Pitt of the necessity of overthrowing the existing Government. At length he had come round to adopt the attitude of Burke. Fear that the French victories and the ascendancy of the violent party might encourage the Republican sympathizers in England — although there is little evidence that they were gaining ground — led to further repression measures. Printers and preachers of sedition, or what was interpreted as such, were prosecuted, and spies were employed to report every sign of disaffection. A few were rigorously punished. One poor billsticker was imprisoned for six months for posting an address asking for parliamentary reform, and an attorney, who remarked in a coffee-house

that he was "for equality and the rights of man," had to go to prison and stand in the pillory. The courts, however, showed their fairness in the acquittal of others, notwithstanding the fact that the Habeas Corpus Act was suspended for the first time since 1745.

The Campaigns of 1794–1795. — The Reign of Terror in France came to an end, July, 1794, when Robespierre was arrested, together with a number of his violent associates. With the moderates again in control and the prospect of a stable government, the English peace party raised its voice. Pitt, however, realized that it was not a time to secure favorable terms. To be sure, the British successes continued at sea, particularly in a notable fight lasting from 28 May to 1 June, 1794, known as the "Glorious First of June," where Hood won a decisive victory over the Brest fleet, though he failed to intercept a provision convoy from America for which the French were anxiously waiting. But the campaign of 1794–1795 in the Austrian Netherlands resulted disastrously for the Allies, who were forced to evacuate the country, whereupon the Franco-Dutch party set up the Batavian Republic, and, 10 May, 1795, entered into a dependent alliance with the French invaders. Prussia, who was mainly interested in the final partition of Poland which took place in this year, concluded peace with the French, 5 April, and, 22 July, Spain followed suit. Austria, thus isolated, was, in spite of subsidies advanced by Great Britain and Russia, unable to hold her ground against the French either in Germany or Northern Italy. Moreover, royalist risings in the west of France, assisted by French émigrés and British forces, were resolutely stamped out.

Suffering and Discontent in England. The Repressive Acts of 1795. — The year 1795, so disastrous to the Allies on the Continent, was also marked by great suffering among the English poor, largely accentuated by a succession of bad harvests. Bread riots broke out in many places, and the Government, in spite of its efforts to meet the situation, was blamed for the prevailing distress. Two more repressive measures resulted. The Treasonable Practices Bill declared the mere speaking or writing against the King or the established Government to be treason and made it a misdemeanor to incite another to such speaking or writing. The Seditious Meetings Bill forbade any political meeting except upon previous notice by a resident householder, and authorized any two justices of the peace to dissolve even a meeting called in a legal way. These drastic acts were fortunately limited in duration, and, as a matter of fact, were never enforced.

The Critical Years 1796–1797. — The power of France was greatly strengthened by a new constitution, October, 1795, vesting the executive in a Directory of five. Carnot, who was a leading member, planned a comprehensive campaign against Austria in which three armies were to converge against Vienna by way of the Main, the Danube, and the Po. While the two northern armies were unsuccessful, the third, under Napoleon Bonaparte, managed to push its way to within eighty miles of Vienna. In consequence, the Austrians were forced to sue for peace in April, 1797, while Pitt was now ready to treat, since the Republican excesses had apparently run their course and the French government seemed established on a stable basis; but the Directory rejected his advances; indeed, as a matter of fact, in spite of a strong peace party in France they nourished dreams of ruining British trade by closing the Continental ports against her, of isolating her from her European Allies, of stirring up rebellion in Ireland, of invading her shores, and of overthrowing Pitt and the Monarchy. Notwithstanding the fact that two French invasions, — one against Ireland and one against the Welsh coast — miscarried, the condition of England was critical; indeed, the years 1796 and 1797 were the darkest in the whole war. Her allies had met with an almost constant succession of defeats, and, threatened at any moment with an invasion, strenuous efforts were made to strengthen the army and navy and to raise more money. The response was warm and enthusiastic. Yet although a loan of £18,000,000 was subscribed so quickly that hundreds were turned away, an acute monetary crisis followed, due mainly to a scarcity of specie occasioned by payment of foreign subsidies, the necessity of purchasing food supplies abroad, and the closing of the markets in France, Spain, Holland, and Italy, and a certain amount of panic resulting in withdrawal of bank deposits. To meet the threatened run, the Bank of England, after consulting with the Government, suspended cash payments in February, 1797, a measure, intended to be temporary, which lasted till 1819, though there was never more than a slight depreciation of paper.

The Battle off Cape St. Vincent (14 February, 1797). — Notwithstanding the recent fiascos, the French proceeded with their plans of invasion. A Spanish fleet was to join the French at Brest, and, together with a Dutch squadron gathered off the Texel, the combined forces were to make a simultaneous descent on the English coast. On St. Valentine's Day, 14 February, 1797, Sir John Jervis attacked the Spanish, who greatly outnumbered him, off Cape St. Vincent, where, after a hard day's fighting in which Nelson distinguished himself by

his audacious courage, the British fleet won a notable victory.[1] The result was to cheer greatly the English in the midst of their financial crisis and to lessen materially the danger of the dreaded French invasion, though the French and Dutch fleets, each guarded by a British squadron, were still intact.

The Mutinies at Spithead and the Nore (1797). — At this juncture, when all depended upon the navy, a widespread mutiny broke out. While the sailors were worked upon by pamphlets distributed by the democratic societies, they had many real grievances. Their pay had not been increased since the reign of Charles II, though the cost of living had risen 30 to 40 per cent;[2] owing to the dishonesty of contractors their food and clothing were both bad and insufficient; their quarters were frightfully unhealthy, and they were subject to arbitrary and barbarous punishments. Most of the men were pressed, and many of them were recruited from the lowest criminal class, who were ripe for anything. In the winter of 1796–1797 the able seamen, who had an especial grievance in being withdrawn from the more profitable merchant service, sent a petition to Lord Howe. When the Admiralty hesitated to grant their demands, they raised the red flag of mutiny at Spithead on 15 April, just as the fleet for Brest was about to put for sea. Then the authorities agreed to all their claims. It required another armed demonstration, however, before the bill to raise their pay was pushed through Parliament, whereupon Howe, whom the sailors knew affectionately as "Black Dick," went down from London with the news of the vote, together with a royal pardon, and quelled the mutiny. The result encouraged an outbreak, 12 May, in the fleet off the Nore which was destined to reënforce the North Sea squadron. The movement here was in the hands of a much more desperate class who even demanded a voice in the movements of their ships; eventually, owing to the vigorous efforts of the authorities, assisted by the better-minded men, the mutineers were forced to give in and surrender their leader, who was hanged at the yardarm. The Government, recognizing the gravity of the crisis and the justice of the complaints, were wisely lenient.

The End of the First Coalition (1797). The British Victory off Camperdown (11 October). — While Great Britain was struggling with a financial crisis and a mutinous fleet, France, too, was in difficulties. Public spirit was at a low ebb, loans could only be procured at exorbitant rates of interest, and taxes were arbitrary and crushing. Austria however, on 17 October, 1797, concluded with France the Treaty of

[1] Jervis was created Earl St. Vincent.

[2] The pay of the army had to some degree kept pace with changing conditions.

Campo Formio; Great Britain was isolated, and the First Coalition had been broken into pieces. An invasion of England was only averted by another great naval victory. The mutiny had spread even to the fleet of Admiral Duncan who was blockading the Dutch off the Texel, though at length he was strong enough to engage, and won a decisive victory off Camperdown, 11 October, 1792.[1] The French were so reluctant to give up their cherished project, that, in the following spring, they collected an invading force along the coast prepared for transport, but Napoleon, who was placed in command of this "Army of England," felt that it was hopeless to attempt an invasion while Great Britain retained her mastery of the seas. Consequently, he turned to another plan which he had formed, of striking India by way of Egypt. This left England free to deal with a dangerous rebellion which had come to a head in Ireland.

The Situation in Ireland (1782–1789). — In Ireland the grant of legislative independence, in 1782, had done little or nothing to relieve the situation; for the interests of the Roman Catholics, the Protestant Dissenters, the Episcopalians, the native Irish, the Anglo-Irish, the English, the landowners and the peasantry conflicted and intermingled in a most bewildering fashion. The Irish Parliament, while nominally free, was composed of Protestant nobles, gentry, and placemen over whom the English Government officials exercised great control by means of patronage, bribery, and influence. The Roman Catholics not only had no representation but no vote, and were excluded from office, as well as all the professions except that of medicine. The Protestants were divided among themselves; for not a few chafed under the English control, some desired genuine parliamentary reform, while a small group, headed by Grattan, were even desirous of admitting Roman Catholics. Below those who were working mainly for political equality, were the peasantry, whose chief grievances were financial and economic. The exorbitant rents, squeezed from them by the middlemen who hired the lands from the great landlords — often absentees — together with the tithes extorted for the support of the Established Church were burdens which bore heavily on the lessee folk whether Protestant or Catholic. In their wretchedness they saw no hope but in force, and plied their nightly raids with a vengeance, though in Ulster, in spite of common grievances against the agrarian system and the Established Church, the Presbyterians and Catholics formed rival organizations and fought each other with bitter animosity.

[1] Duncan was created Earl of Camperdown.

The French Revolution. Wolfe Tone and the United Irishmen. — In the midst of this wild disorder came the news of the French Revolution and the visit of Revolutionary agents promising the overthrow of tyranny, religious and secular, and a millennium for the downtrodden. The Roman Catholics at first had little sympathy with the movement which included in its propaganda the overthrow of their Church; but the northern Protestants of the lesser sort, many of whom were Republicans at heart, eagerly welcomed the new teachings. They hated the exclusive knot who governed the Irish Parliament as much as they hated those of the opposite faith, and they longed to be rid of middlemen and tithes. There was an opportunity for the ruling classes to maintain their ascendancy by playing the opposing religious parties against each other. Foreseeing this, Wolfe Tone, a Dublin barrister, nominally a Presbyterian but really a free-thinker, formed, in 1791, the Society of United Irishmen, in which he sought to make the hostile elements set aside their religious animosity in pursuit of a common object — the breakdown of the English power through reform of Parliament. Tone's activity caused a split in the ranks of the Roman Catholics. The minority, composed of the bishops and the educated classes who looked to Pitt for further measures of relief, broke off all connection with the more violent majority, who, trusting that persistent agitation would alleviate their rents, and put an end to tithes, threw in their lot with the United Irishmen. Instead of wisely granting sufficient concessions to satisfy the moderates, those in authority, after holding out great hopes, only grudgingly conceded just enough half measures to anger the Protestant clique and to stir up the Roman Catholics to increasing agitation. In 1792 a bill was forced through the Irish Parliament admitting them to the practice of law and repealing restrictions on education and intermarriage. In 1793 they were admitted to the grand juries and to the magistracies; the prohibition to bear arms was repealed and they were given the right to vote for members of the Lower House. This last concession was far from satisfactory; for the poor and ignorant tenantry who received the franchise were completely under the control of the landlords and borough owners, while the wealthy and intelligent Catholics, who might have represented them, were still excluded from sitting in Parliament and from the higher offices of State.

The Approach of Revolution. — However, a liberal-minded Lord Lieutenant who mistakenly thought that Pitt had given him a free hand, directly on his arrival, in 1795, arranged with Grattan to introduce a bill to admit Roman Catholics to Parliament, and dismissed from office the chief of the Protestant connection. The placemen

and pensioners at once set up a furious howl and appealed to London. Pitt, with the French War on his hands and opposed by the Protestant prejudice of George III, bowed to the storm. The Lord Lieutenant was recalled, the old set were reëntrenched in power and the bill was defeated. The result was to defeat the only possible chance of a peaceful settlement of the Irish question. Although the violence of the embittered Catholics forced a number of northern Protestants over to the Government side, many of the disappointed were thrown into the arms of the United Irishmen, who, after being forcibly suppressed in 1794, were reconstituted on a basis distinctly Republican and treasonable, adopted military organization and appealed to France,[1] whither Tone went for aid in 1796. The French reply was to send the two expeditions which came to such a futile end. Meanwhile, the Government acted with prompt decision. In the autumn of 1796 the Habeas Corpus Act was suspended, and bodies of yeomanry and infantry were organized from the gentry. Shortly before the sailing of the French fleet several leaders of the United Irishmen were arrested in Belfast. Early in 1797 martial law was proclaimed. Arms were searched for and seized, houses were burned and Catholics were barbarously tortured and put to death. There were few regular troops in the country, and the volunteers who supplied their place were goaded to excess by long existing feuds. The English Commander-in-Chief sought to mitigate their harshness, but he was overruled and resigned, and the work of suppression was carried on by a less merciful successor. Informers reported regularly the movements of the conspirators, the Irish authorities were given free hand and the English Ministers declined all requests to interfere on the side of leniency.

The Rebellion of 1798. — A general rising was planned for 23 May, 1798, but, owing to the prompt arrest of many leaders, to the loyalty of the moderate Catholics, and the energy of the authorities, the designs of the rebels were in a large measure frustrated. An attempt on Dublin failed, and a rising in Kildare, marked by destruction and cruelty on the part of the insurgents, was speedily put down. In various other counties they were suppressed with a savagery that surpassed their own. Houses in which arms were found were burned, suspected persons were shot or barbarously tortured. After the revolts to the north and west had been practically suppressed, the civil war came to a head in Wexford and Wicklow, where little resistance had been anticipated. The outbreak, particularly in Wexford, where

[1] Many of the more desperate Roman Catholics were won over to the godless French Revolutionists by the assurance that they had improved the lot of the lesser man, and had abolished tithes.

civil war waged for some weeks, was precipitated by the Protestant yeomanry and militia, though their excesses in Ulster had had precisely the opposite result. Anti-Protestant hatred was abundantly inflamed by fiery sermons, but, frenzied and undisciplined, the insurgents failed to make the most of their opportunities except for violence and revenge.[1] The loyalist forces struggled bravely until the arrival of British troops, who broke the back of the rebellion. It had been practically confined to the province of Leinster, for only two outbreaks had occurred in all Ulster, while Munster and Connaught remained quiet.

The Aftermath of 1798. — The French, hampered by the fact that the British fleets controlled the Channel, sent two more small expeditions to Ireland, which arrived after the rebellion was over, only to be finally overcome and taken. Among the prisoners was Wolfe Tone, who was condemned to death, but committed suicide in prison. Lord Cornwallis, who had succeeded as Lord Lieutenant and Commander-in-Chief, 20 June, managed, by an act of indemnity containing only a few exceptions, to check the bloodthirsty execution which followed the Wexford war. Unhappily, the burning and wasting, the ruthless destruction of life and property committed by both parties, impoverished the country, led to a stagnation of industry and credit, revived and accentuated the old religious and racial animosities, and undid the effect of such slight conciliation as had been attempted during the past two decades. The most direct result of the Rebellion was to determine Pitt and his Cabinet to bring about a union between the Irish and the English Parliaments. As early as 1782 he had thought of this possibility as the only solution of the vexed question of Catholic relief. Catholic members absorbed in the English Protestant Parliament would count for little, while they would inevitably dominate the Irish, once they were admitted within its walls. Moreover, a union offered a means of breaking up the corrupt rule of the Protestant minority and of checking the revengeful fury of the Protestant Orangemen.

The Irish Union (1799–1800). — The proposal, brought forward in the Irish Parliament in 1799, was bitterly, and, for the moment, successfully opposed by the leaders of the Irish Opposition, headed by Grattan, though the Roman Catholic bishops supported the Government in the hope of securing provision for their priests, commutation of tithes into money payments, and Catholic emancipation. The main energies of Cornwallis, aided by his Secretary, Castlereagh, were directed toward the manipulation of the members of Parliament and the power-

[1] Many of the better sort, however, including priests, did their best to preserve order.

ful interests which controlled the seats, justifying the means which they employed on the ground of disagreeable necessity. To Cornwallis it was particularly "dirty work," for which he despised himself, and he often longed to kick those whom he was obliged to court. Not daring to hazard a general election, some members of the existing House of Commons were replaced by supporters of the Government; some votes were bought with titles, places and pensions, some by direct bribes, though the amount employed for the latter purpose has doubtless been greatly exaggerated, and Cornwallis seems not to have had anything to do with it. In one way and another, however, the Government spent £1,000,000. Notwithstanding the preponderating strength of the Government supporters, the anti-Unionists fought stubbornly, even raising £100,000 to outbid their opponents. The Articles of Union were carried in the new session which opened, 15 January, 1800, and the bill based upon them, after passing both the Irish and English Parliaments, received the royal assent, 1 August.

The Terms of Union. — By the terms of the Act of Union, four spiritual peers, sitting in rotation in successive sessions, and twenty-eight temporal peers elected for life, represented Ireland in the House of Lords,[1] and one hundred members in the House of Commons. Free trade was established between the two countries. The preservation of the United Church of England and Ireland was to be an "essential and fundamental part of the Union."

Pitt and the Union. His Resignation (1801). — The Union seemed to offer a way out of pressing difficulties. Nevertheless, the measure was carried by methods that cannot be justified, and was forced down the throats of the Irish, five sixths of whom were against it. Furthermore, the most influential Roman Catholics were won over by the assurance circulated by Castlereagh that as soon as the Parliaments were united they would be rewarded by the three concessions which they desired — State payment for their priests, commutation of tithes, and, above all, Catholic emancipation. While Pitt gave no formal pledges, he was sincerely anxious to realize their hopes; but he had to contend against the monumental obstinacy of King George, who had been persuaded that he could not grant Catholic relief without a breach of his coronation oath binding him to maintain the existing Establishment in Church and State. However, in September, 1800, Pitt brought a measure of Catholic relief before the Cabinet for discussion. One of his colleagues betrayed the secret to the King, so that the Prime Minister had no opportunity, either of preparing the

[1] Contrary to the Scotch practice, Irish peers, not in the House of Lords, were eligible for election to the House of Commons.

mind of his Sovereign gradually or of pushing through his project with a rush. When he formally opened the question in January, George declared: "I shall reckon any man my personal enemy who proposes such a measure." Rather than oppose the royal will he resigned, 5 February, 1801, and in March, after the King had been threatened with another attack of his old malady, he agreed, whether in or out of office, never again to open the question during the reign. The failure to carry these concessions to which the Government was morally if not literally bound, was responsible for much of the trouble with Ireland which followed.

Napoleon in Egypt (1798–1799). — A few days before the outbreak of the Rebellion of 1798, Napoleon started for the Mediterranean with the design of destroying the British power in India. He was able to carry out the first steps in his new project without a setback. He captured Malta, passed on to Egypt, took Alexandria, July, 1798, and defeated the Mamelukes[1] in the Battle of the Pyramids on the 21st. Nelson, however, in hot pursuit, attacked him at Aboukir Bay, and in the famous battle of the Nile, 1 August, destroyed his fleet, and with it his hopes of establishing a French empire in the East. Napoleon, after his defeat, started for Syria with the view of capturing Constantinople and attacking Europe from the East. Failing in an attempt to take Acre, the key to the control of the Syrian coast, May, 1799, he returned to Egypt, where he received news which caused him to leave his army and hasten to France. In India, Tipu — the successor of his father Haidar Ali as ruler of Mysore — who had been in communication with Napoleon, was awaiting aid from him to start a revolt. To anticipate the threatened danger, the Governor-General, Lord Mornington, sent an army against him. Tipu was defeated and slain, while Mysore was divided and placed under British protection. Mornington was created Marquis of Wellesley. The failure of the Eastern expedition was attended by two important results: it averted a serious danger to the British ascendancy in India as well as the supremacy of British commerce in the East, and it led to the formation of the Second Coalition.

The Second Coalition (1799–1801). — The first step toward the new Coalition was taken by the half-crazy Paul, Emperor of Russia, prompted among other things by fear of the spread of republicanism, but the actual organization was the work of Pitt. The Coalition, consisting of Great Britain, Russia, Austria, Portugal, Naples, and

[1] Formerly slaves, they were now an effective body of cavalry who, under their beys or chiefs, ruled the country, of which the Sultan of Turkey was the nominal overlord.

Turkey, was completed in the early months of 1799. At the start the Allies were successful in forcing the French across the Rhine and in driving them out of northern Italy, but in the autumn of 1799 the tide began to turn. A Russian army, with a body of Austrian allies, was defeated at Zurich, and a joint invasion of Holland by the British and Russians resulted in an inglorious capitulation and retirement. During the winter, Paul, disgusted at the failure of his arms and convinced that Austria and Great Britain had not coöperated cordially with him, withdrew from the Coalition.

The Breakup of the Second Coalition. — Meantime, Napoleon hurrying from Egypt had reached France in October. With the aid of his grenadiers the Directory, which had grown very unpopular, was overthrown by a *coup d'état*, and, by a new Constitution proclaimed in December, the fourth since 1789, Napoleon was made First Consul for ten years with virtually supreme powers. In England the burden of the war was growing heavier and heavier, an income tax went into effect in April, 1799, and new loans were contracted. The commercial classes were thriving and so were the farmers; but the poor suffered more and more from soaring prices, especially of food. A meeting was held in London which petitioned for peace; but the great majority still supported the war policy of the Government, and frowned on the expression of Revolutionary opinion. Accordingly, bills were passed, toward the end of the year 1800, suppressing corresponding societies, restricting debating societies and combinations of workmen, and obliging printers to obtain certificates and to affix their signatures to all they printed. Austria, who was supporting the Allied cause in northern Italy, was defeated by Napoleon at Marengo, 14 June, 1800, largely owing to the failure of the British to send troops in season. Great Britain recovered Malta, but the Austrians, defeated at Hohenlinden, 3 December, were unable to hold out any longer, and 9 February, 1801, signed the peace of Lunéville. The Second Coalition had gone the way of the first.

The Bombardment of Copenhagen (1801). — Paul, won over by the blandishments of Napoleon whom he hoped would crush out Republicanism and establish a dynasty, had, in the meantime, planned an armed neutrality similar to that organized by his mother nearly twenty years earlier. Its signature by Russia, Sweden, Denmark and Prussia in December, 1800, made the situation again critical for Great Britain. She was bereft of her strongest allies, while the action of the Northern Powers threatened not only to exclude her from profitable markets but to cut off her main source of supply for naval stores and for much of her wheat. However, the British navy was still the strong-

est on the seas and was successfully blockading the French and Spanish in all their principal ports. On 14 January, 1801, the Government placed an embargo on the ships of Russia, Sweden, and Denmark and prepared to send a fleet to the Baltic. It sailed for Copenhagen, 12 March, under Sir Hyde Parker, with Nelson second in command. When the Danes refused to accede to the British demands the fleet attacked their capital. Exposed to a fierce bombardment, the city must soon have surrendered, when suddenly the news arrived that Paul had been murdered in the night of 23 March. His successor, Alexander I, being willing to compromise, it was agreed that blockades by proclamation should be given up and the right of search was more accurately defined, and the League broke up without gaining its other demands. The French forces left behind in Egypt, after a series of defeats, were forced to abandon the country in September. As an offset to these British successes the French scored some diplomatic gains; Spain, for example, ceded back Louisiana, 21 March, 1801, and agreed to make war on Portugal, who was obliged to contract alliances with both France and Spain and to close her ports against Great Britain.

The Peace of Amiens (25 **March**, 1802).—Pitt, on his resignation the previous February, was succeeded by Addington, a dull though well-meaning man in close agreement with the King. Under the new Government the peace negotiations were finally concluded at Amiens, 25 March, 1802. Great Britain gave up all her conquests from France together with all those from French allies except Trinidad and Ceylon, which had been taken from the Spanish and the Dutch respectively. The Cape of Good Hope, also a conquest from the Dutch, was to be a free port, Egypt was to be handed back to Turkey, while Malta was to be restored to the Knights of St. John, to whom it belonged, and its independence guaranteed by the signatory powers. Such were the main terms of the peace, which in the words of Sheridan: "all men are glad of, but no man can be proud of."

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

See Chapter XLVII below.

CHAPTER XLVII

THE STRUGGLE AGAINST NAPOLEON: FROM AMIENS TO WATERLOO (1802–1815)

The Resumption of War (1803). — The Peace of Amiens proved to be a mere breathing time. Indeed, Napoleon admitted frankly that: "A renewal of war was necessary for his existence"; and before many months it became evident that he was bent on utterly destroying the European balance of power, while his colonial projects were even more disquieting to great Britain; for he planned to recover Egypt and stir up disaffection in India. In one direction his designs miscarried. He had aimed to establish a great empire in North America; but a revolt in San Domingo cost him so many troops that he gave up his project in disgust and sold Louisiana to the United States in the spring of 1803. Yet, in spite of all, he had in no way violated the letter of the treaty of Amiens. On the other hand, he had long resented the attacks made upon him in papers conducted by French exiles in London. To be sure, Jean Peltier, editor of *L'Ambigu*, who was particularly ferocious, was convicted of libel, though numbers of Englishmen were outspoken against the sentence, and the Government refused either to expel the émigrés or to suppress their papers. Moreover, Great Britain refused to evacuate Malta, on the ground of Russia's refusal to guarantee the independence of the island,[1] and she persisted in holding on to the French towns in India. This failure to carry out the terms agreed upon at Amiens technically justified Napoleon's angry accusation that Great Britain was a nation that did not respect treaties; but he was the real disturber of Europe, and it was a genuine fear that they could not keep peace with honor or safety which led the British to declare war, 18 May, 1803. The situation was absolutely changed since the beginning of the conflict ten years before. It was no longer a question of the preservation of monarchy, aristocracy, and property against the spread of Republicanism, now it was a struggle for exist-

[1] In view of the resumption of Napoleon's designs against Egypt, Turkey, and India, it would have been quite unsafe to allow the island to fall again into his hands.

ence on the part of Great Britain and the Continental countries against Napoleonic aggrandizement.

Pitt's Second Ministry (May, 1804, to January, 1806). The Third Coalition. — In view of the crisis, Pitt succeeded Addington, 29 April, 1804. Greatly broken in health and hampered by a growing Whig opposition, he set to work undauntedly, and, before the close of 1805, had combined Russia and Austria with Great Britain in the Third Coalition against Napoleon, who in the meantime had had himself crowned Emperor of the French and King of Italy.

End of the Third Coalition. — Napoleon desired to undertake again the invasion of England which he had been once obliged to give up. To this end, he gathered an army at Boulogne which was to be conveyed across the Channel in flat-bottom boats under cover of the Brest and Toulon fleets. In order to shake off Nelson who had been watching the Mediterranean for two years, Admiral Villeneuve sailed with the Toulon squadron to the West Indies. Nelson, however, followed him over and back, and finally engaged him, off Cape Trafalgar, 21 October, 1805, and though mortally wounded in the action, lived long enough to learn that he had won a great victory. Again, as in 1797, England had been saved by her navy. Some weeks before, Napoleon, despairing of any help from Villeneuve, had marched across the Rhine with his "Army of England." He entered Vienna, 13 November, whence he marched forth and at Austerlitz gained a decisive victory, 2 December, over the Austrians and a contingent of Russians. By the Peace of Pressburg, concluded on the 26th, the Austrian Emperor was obliged once more to withdraw from the war. The break-up of the Coalition was too much for Pitt, whose constitution was already undermined by drink and overwork, though in his last speech he showed that invincible faith which had animated him from the beginning of the struggle, by the memorable words: "England has saved herself by her exertions, and will, as I trust, save Europe by her example." He died 23 January, 1806. In one sense Pitt had not shown himself to be a great War Minister: he frittered away the resources of the country in subsidies to foreign Powers and in scattered, futile expeditions. On the other hand, his popularity, his persistence and courage kept alive the national enthusiasm and thus tided the war over a critical period. He was succeeded by the "Ministry of all the Talents," a coalition in which the Whigs were largely in the majority. Fox, who became Foreign Secretary, only survived his great rival by a few months, closing his career, marked by single-hearted devotion to the cause of oppressed humanity, 13 September, 1806. However, he had often lacked judgment in his obstructionist policy and he failed in his dearest hope of

bringing about a peace. The break-up of the Third Coalition ended the attempts of the British Government to wage war against Napoleon by means of such dynastic combinations. Fox had long declaimed against them, and Pitt before his death had come to recognize their futility. Under new men, another policy was soon developed of aiding national risings against Napoleonic aggression — a policy which led ultimately to glorious results.

Napoleon's Further Triumphs (1806–1807). — Frederick William III had been bribed by the gift of the Kingdom of Hanover to join the French side and to close his ports to British ships; unable, however, to endure the constant humiliation which Napoleon heaped upon him — particularly when, regardless of his recent concession, the Dictator offered to restore Hanover to Great Britain — the Prussian King was obliged to declare war. Without a single ally to help him his armies were crushed at the twin battles of Jena and Auerstädt, 14 October, 1806. Although Russia managed, 8 February, 1807, to administer the first check to Napoleon's victorious career in the drawn battle of Eylau, the British Government failed to profit by the opportunity to send troops or even adequate subsidies, and, assisted only by the feeble support of Prussia, the Russians were overwhelmed at Friedland, 14 June, 1807. The Tsar Alexander, incensed at Great Britain's neglect, desirous of conquering the Turks who had declared war on him, and full of vague dreams for the reconstruction of Europe, thereupon gave ear to Napoleon's enticing proposal for dividing between them the empire of the East and West. The two held an interview which resulted in the Treaty of Tilsit, 7 July, 1807, to which Prussia was forced to accede. Among other things, the Tsar agreed to join France in coercing Sweden, Denmark, and Portugal into adopting Napoleon's "Continental System" by which the European markets were to be closed to British trade, and, by a secret article, even pledged himself to join in a war against Great Britain in case she did not make peace before 1 November, while the French Emperor agreed to render like assistance to Alexander against the Turks and the Poles. To forestall the danger in the north, Great Britain promptly sent a naval armament to Denmark, offering an alliance to which the condition was attached that the Danes lend their navy to the British Government. On their refusal, Copenhagen was bombarded and the Danish fleet taken to England as a prize of war. This high-handed act, which caused a great outcry even among the English, was justified on the ground of military necessity.

The Continental System. — Already, 21 November, 1806, Napoleon had issued his celebrated Berlin Decree, which proclaimed a

blockade of the British Isles; prohibited all commerce between them and France including the States dependent on her; and announced the confiscation of British merchandise in the harbors of such countries. On 7 January, 1807, British Orders in Council forbade neutrals, under penalty of forfeiting ships and cargo, to trade between the ports of France and her allies, or between ports of nations which should observe the Berlin Decree. Napoleon's Milan Decree of December, 1807, and other restrictive measures, were followed by more Orders in Council till neutral trade was in theory absolutely destroyed, while, by the close of 1808, every country of Europe, except Sweden and Turkey, had been brought into the System. Neither side, however, could enforce completely its policy of commercial exclusiveness. Not only was there much smuggling, but both the Emperor and the British Government were obliged to issue licenses authorizing evasion in specified cases. Napoleon's plan was to reduce Great Britain to subjection by a policy of absolute isolation; but Britain had an overwhelming advantage in her method of warfare. She controlled the seas, she was able to exercise a far more effective right of search than the French, and with her powerful navy she was able to inflict irreparable damage on the merchant marine of those whom Napoleon sought to combine against her. Moreover, he needed commodities which she alone could supply, such as cloth, machinery and certain raw materials; indeed, on one occasion, he procured 50,000 British overcoats for his troops. However, inadequately as it was enforced, his Continental System caused serious hardship and suffering to the countries involved, and contributed, perhaps as much as his territorial aggressions, toward the growth of that combined national opposition which subsequently overthrew him.

The Opening of the Peninsular War (1808). — Spain set the example. As a step in enforcing his Continental System Napoleon determined to secure control of the Peninsula, to close its vast stretch of seacoast to British shipping; to break up the alliance which had connected England and Portugal for over a century and to possess himself of Portugal's rich and extensive colonies. To that end he deluded the Spanish Minister Godoy into making a treaty whereby the House of Braganza[1] was to be driven from the throne and its Kingdom partitioned between Spain and France. Having established an army for the ostensible purpose of conquering Portugal, he took advantage of a revolt against the worthless Charles IV — during which his still more worthless son Ferdinand was proclaimed in his stead — to force both of them to retire on a pension, and to set up his brother Joseph

[1] The Royal House of Portugal.

as King of Spain. This was in May, 1808. The original rising of the Spanish had been prompted by fear of French subjugation, and the movement now spread swiftly throughout the land. Already, in the latter part of 1807, the royal family of Braganza had fled to Brazil; but the Portuguese, counting on British support, also rose in rebellion and forced Junot, the commander of the French invading army, to shut himself up in Lisbon. On 13 August, 1808, Sir Arthur Wellesley landed near Oporto with a force of 12,000 men, bearing instructions to afford "the Spanish and Portuguese nations every possible aid in throwing off the yoke of France." Thus began a six years' conflict known as the Peninsular War. After a terrific struggle the British army which — largely through the efforts of Castlereagh [1] — had been reorganized into an effective fighting force, finally succeeded in driving the French across the Pyrenees.

The French Evacuate Portugal (1808). The Spanish Campaign (1808–1809). — Castlereagh had designed Wellesley for the supreme command in Portugal; but the latter's efforts were hampered for a time by the fact that two ineffective seniors were placed over him in succession. He routed the French, 21 August, 1808; but was not allowed to follow up his victory, and terms were made by which Junot's army was permitted to evacuate Portugal. In October, Sir John Moore was given the command under orders to coöperate with the Spanish against the French forces in Spain, south of the Ebro. Owing to inadequate equipment and the ineffective support of the native levies he was obliged to turn and flee before the French. Conducting a masterly retreat, he reached Corunna, 16 January, 1809, where he managed to repulse his pursuers and cover the embarkation of his troops, though he himself was mortally wounded and was buried on the field of battle. Such were the unpromising beginnings of a great triumph. Napoleon, who declared that "no Power under the influence of England can exist on the Continent," failed to realize the strength of a people, however incapable and undisciplined, once roused to defend their native land against foreign aggression. The boastfulness of the Spanish far exceeded their achievements; often they embarrassed the British by their untrustworthiness and insubordination; but, by their relentless hostility to the invader and their persistent guerilla warfare, they contributed in no small degree toward the final success of their ally in liberating their country.

Wagram and Walcheren (1809). — The Spanish example encouraged Austria once more to enter the lists; but Napoleon hurried an army

[1] As Secretary for War (1807–1809), in a new Cabinet which replaced the "Ministry of all the Talents" March, 1807.

SPAIN.
TO ILLUSTRATE THE
WAR IN THE PENINSULA.
1803-1814.
English Miles
0 20 40 60 80 100 120
BAY OF BISCAY
MEDITERRANEAN SEA
ATLANTIC OCEAN
GULF OF LYONS
Pyrenees Mts.
SPAIN
PORTUGAL
MADRID
C. ORTEGAL
Corunna
Ferrol
C. FINISTERRE
Vigo
Oporto
R. Douro
R. Minho
Santander
San Sebastian
Bayonne
To Paris
Vittoria
Burgos
R. Esla
Pampeluna
Navarette
Tudela
Valladolid
R. Pisuerga
Saragossa
Almenara
R. Ebro
Barcelona
Almeida
Salamanca
Ciudad Rodrigo
Brihuega
R. Tagus
Banos
Talavera
Toledo
Br. of Almaraz
Br. of Arzobispo
C. Mondego
Lisbon
Elvas
Badajoz
Alduera
R. Guadiana
Almanza
Valencia
C. NÃO
Ivica
Minorca
Port Mahon
Majorca
Baylen
Cordova
Seville
Granada
Cartagena
C. St. Vincent
Cadiz
Barrosa
C. Trafalgar
Gibraltar
C. Tarifa
C. Gata

across Europe, and, by a series of victories culminating in the bloody battle of Wagram, 6 July, forced her to sign a peace at Vienna which put her out of the fighting for four years. Meantime, the British, 28 July, had sent a tremendous armament to attack Antwerp, to close the Scheldt and to reduce the island of Walcheren; but the expedition was hopelessly mismanaged, and, 27 December, returned ingloriously home. Fortunately, 2 April, 1809, Wellesley had finally been appointed Commander-in-Chief of the British armies in the Peninsula. Before leaving England he submitted to the Government a plan for the conduct of the war to which he adhered steadfastly in his subsequent campaigns. This was to make Portugal the center of his operations. With the sea on the west and the mountains on the east he had a base which could be readily supplied by the British navy, and which could be easily defended against the French. Shortly after his arrival he advanced into Spain, in the direction of Madrid, with a combined force of British and Spanish; but though, 27, 28 July, he defeated a French army drawn up to bar his progress, his victory was barren of immediate results. The diverting of men and supplies for the fruitless Walcheren expedition threw him on his own resources and exposed him to great deprivation, at a time when Napoleon's victorious Austrian campaign freed thousands of French troops who overran Spain. So he retired to Portugal to wait for better times.

The Beginning of the Regency (1811). — In November, 1810, George III, after six years of failing eyesight, became blind: his insanity came on again as well, and he passed the last ten years of his life in complete mental and physical darkness. Within a few months, the Prince of Wales was made permanent Regent, but contrary to the hopes of the Whigs his advent brought no change in the party situation; for the overtures which he chose to make were not such as they could accept. When, 11 May, 1812, Spencer Perceval — who had been Prime Minister since 1809 — was struck down by a demented assassin, Lord Liverpool was chosen to head the Cabinet; most of the Ministers were retained and the Tory ascendancy continued unbroken for fifteen years.

The Peninsular Campaign (1810–1812). — The Turn of the Tide (1812). — The French made a vain attempt, during the winter months of 1810–1811, to penetrate impregnable lines of defense which Wellington [1] had constructed between the Tagus and the sea, north of Lisbon, after which they retired from Portugal much spent by the campaign. The following year was marked by bloody battles along the Spanish border and by harassing guerilla warfare conducted by the natives.

[1] Wellesley had been created Viscount Wellington in 1809.

Owing to Napoleon's withdrawal of 60,000 of his best troops to assist in the invasion of Russia, Wellington made notable gains early in 1812. Securing control of the northern and southern roads between Spain and Portugal, he marched north and defeated a French army in the decisive battle of Salamanca, by which he forced Joseph to abandon Madrid. With inadequate supplies and equipment he pressed on after the remnant of the beaten army, to the great peril of his recently acquired lines of communication from other French forces south and west. Thus endangered, and suffering from lack of food, his troops, becoming utterly demoralized, broke loose from all restraints. It required all his iron will to restore discipline; but it proved to be the last crisis he had to weather. The Liverpool Ministry, backed by popular sentiment, had come to appreciate his achievements and from now on gave him enthusiastic support, while the French, weakened by the loss of their best troops and worn down by the incessant attacks of the natives, steadily lost ground.

The Close of the Peninsular Campaign (April, 1814). — He opened the campaign of 1813 with the fixed intention of driving the French out of Spain. With his army recruited and supplied in Portugal, he advanced northeast, driving the enemy before him, and at Vittoria fought, 21 June, the greatest battle of the war. The French were nearly surrounded and only finally saved themselves by headlong flight. Then Wellington forced the passage of the Pyrenees, in October, and drove his opponent from Bayonne to Bordeaux and thence to Toulouse, which the British finally captured in April, 1814, though it cost them more troops than the French. Meantime, Napoleon had been overcome and compelled to abdicate and the Peninsular War was over. Wellington, while he made many mistakes in tactics and strategy, deserves the utmost credit for realizing the significance of the liberation of Portugal and Spain as a decisive factor in the struggle against Napoleon, and for sticking to his work in the teeth of all manner of discouragements and hardships, until he brought it to a glorious conclusion.

The Russian Campaign (1812). — Some time before, Napoleon's annexations and his rigid enforcement of the Continental System had prepared the way for a breach with Russia. In January, 1811, the Tsar asserted himself by opening his ports to neutrals and imposing a duty upon French commodities, whereupon Napoleon, for a second time disregarding the irresistible power of popular national hostility, took the fatal step. Invading Russia, 24 June, 1812, with a great army of over 300,000 men, he marched to certain destruction, through a vast barren country, teeming with a sullen hostile population, and driving

before him an army ready to turn and pounce upon him when his forces were sufficiently exhausted. On 7 September, the bloody but indecisive battle of Borodino cost the French 30,000 men and the Russians 40,000. Thence the Russian commander retreated to Moscow, but departed with all the military stores and the bulk of the inhabitants on the approach of Napoleon. On the 14th, the day the French entered the city, a destructive fire broke out which raged for six days. Failing to bring Alexander to terms, Napoleon was obliged to evacuate Moscow and retrace his steps with the Russians hanging on his rear. Worn down by the frequent attacks of his pursuers and by the hardships of a terrible winter, a miserable remnant of not more than 60,000 from the army of invasion dragged themselves out of the country. The Russians were too exhausted to deal a crushing blow, and the other Powers did not at once realize the magnitude of the disaster which had befallen the hitherto victorious despot.

The War of Liberation (1813–1814). — Napoleon, with unquenchable energy and resource, was able, by a drastic conscription, to gather a new army and resume the offensive in the following year. But Prussia and Austria had at length roused themselves and combined forces with Russia. Although Great Britain sent no troops to Germany, where the conflict centered, she sent subsidies, which was all and more than could be expected of her, since she was bearing the burden of the Peninsular campaign and had a war with the United States as well. The Russians opened the memorable campaign of 1813 by resuming their pursuit of the retreating French through northern Germany. Frederick William, in spite of an alliance which he had been forced to conclude with Napoleon on the eve of the Russian invasion, had issued stirring appeals to his people to join the War of Liberation, and declared war against France, 17 March, 1813. Napoleon's plan was to crush Russia and Prussia, and then to concentrate his whole strength on Austria, who clung for a time to a policy of mediation; but his plan came to naught. Austria declared war, 12 August, and in the " Battle of the Nations " at Leipzig, 17, 18, 19 October, he received a crushing defeat. In those three bloody days Prussia showed the fruits of a wonderful administrative and military reorganization which her patriotic statesmen and generals had been slowly perfecting during the recent years of her humiliation, and her *Landwehr* or national levy, aided by Russian and Austrian allies, gloriously revenged the past. National risings against the French domination spread throughout Europe. Napoleon's troops were forced to abandon everything beyond the Rhine, the Alps and the Pyrenees, and to take refuge behind their own borders. The Allies moved on France with three

great armies, and, 31 March, occupied Paris and proclaimed the restoration of the Bourbon line in the person of Louis XVIII.[1] Napoleon, after a vain attempt to recover the capital, was forced to consent to an unconditional abdication, 11 April, 1814. The Allies, however, allowed him the island of Elba as an independent principality, where he arrived 4 May.

The War of 1812 with the United States: Its Causes. — Great Britain was now free to devote her energies to the war with the United States which had broken out nearly two years before, as a direct result of the Continental System. During the first years of the French War the United States drove a thriving neutral trade, but all was changed when Napoleon and the British Government by Imperial Decrees and Orders in Council proclaimed a state of blockade, and, particularly, when the two contending Powers, in order to force the United States into an alliance, began to seize her ships accused of trading with the prohibited ports. President Jefferson and the Republican party sought to avoid war, but the Federalists, hoping to secure greater commercial privileges from the mistress of the seas, favored Great Britain. The British, however, aroused increasing animosity by the rigid exercise of the right which they claimed of searching American vessels and impressing such of the crews as were British born,[2] the friction being accentuated by the British contention that the Americans encouraged desertion by offers of higher pay. Following a temporary measure, in 1806, forbidding the import of a number of British commodities, Jefferson, in 1807, caused an Embargo Act to be passed prohibiting all trade with European countries. Owing to the fact that this restriction hurt the Americans as much as those against whom it was aimed, a Non-intercourse Act was substituted, 1 March, 1809, which applied only to Great Britain, France, and their dependencies. It expired in May, 1810, with the provision that if either Power repealed its Orders or Decrees it might be revived against the other. Madison, who became President in 1809, having been led to believe that Napoleon had canceled his Decrees, revived the Non-intercourse Act against Great Britain in February, 1811. Directly the Liverpool

[1] He was a younger brother of Louis XVI, whose son, nominally Louis XVII, died a prisoner of the Revolutionary Government, 8 June, 1795. There is apparently little doubt that the little Dauphin died, though many pretenders appeared later to impersonate him.

[2] According to the British law no subject could forsake his allegiance without the consent of the Government, while, according to the United States, any foreigner could become an American citizen after residing in the country for a specified term of years, and fulfilling certain legal requirements. The British did not alter their law till 1870.

Ministry took office, it withdrew the Orders in Council; but it was too late, for the United States declared war, 18 June, 1812.

The Course of the War (1812–1814). The Treaty of Ghent (24 December, 1814). — Neither side was in a position to be very effective. While Great Britain was involved in the Peninsular War, the United States was ill-prepared with money, supplies, and troops. It was a great disappointment to the Americans that the Canadians remained loyal; the Indians, too, were on the British side, and the campaigns on the Canadian border proved generally ineffective. The failures in that direction, however, were redeemed by a series of brilliant victories at sea. Contrary to the prevailing traditions of the past two centuries, the fighting consisted of engagements between individual ships instead of fleets. The American ships, though fewer in number, were superior in every way to those of the enemy; they were larger and better built; they carried more and heavier guns; their crews were bigger; they included a greater proportion of able seamen and more accurate marksmen. While defeats in single engagements were far less disastrous than those in which whole squadrons were involved, they had the effect of seriously lowering the maritime prestige which the British had so long enjoyed. The success of Commodore Perry on Lake Erie, in 1813, was another asset for the Americans, though, as the war progressed, they gained fewer victories at sea. Profiting by experience, the British avoided ships likely to outclass them and improved their gunnery. Moreover, they maintained a more effective blockade in American waters, in consequence of which the Americans, while the more destructive of commerce, suffered severely from the cutting off of their own trade. After the overthrow of Napoleon, 14,000 British regulars were sent over; but owing to ineffective generalship, they accomplished far less than had been expected. One force, however, succeeded in capturing Washington, and during an occupation of less than a week they burned all the public buildings, a regrettable action that has been defended on the ground that the Americans had set the example in two small towns on the Canadian border. Toward the close of the year, another army of Peninsular veterans was dispatched across the Atlantic, which was defeated at New Orleans by General Andrew Jackson, 8 January, 1815. It was a needless sacrifice of life; for peace had already been signed at Ghent, 24 December. The Treaty provided for a mutual restoration of conquests and for the appointment of commissioners to settle outstanding differences, notably those relating to boundaries. Strangely enough, the issues which led to the conflict were not mentioned: the Orders in Council had been withdrawn before the opening of hostilities, and

with the fall of Napoleon the encroachments on neutral trade ceased. Yet, as a result of this otherwise futile war, Great Britain tacitly dropped her claim to right of search.

The First Treaty of Paris (30 May, 1814), and the Opening of the Congress of Vienna. — By a treaty, signed at Paris, 30 May, 1814, between the new French Monarch and the four allied Powers of Great Britain, Russia, Austria and Prussia the boundaries of France were reduced to those of 1792 and the independence of various States subjugated by Napoleon was recognized. In order to readjust the disturbed European situation and to make the necessary arrangements for carrying out the terms of the Treaty, a Congress was appointed to meet at Vienna, which assembled in September and continued till June 1815. Castlereagh represented Great Britain till February, when Wellington came to take his place. The Duke,[1] however, was soon called away by the startling news that Napoleon had escaped from Elba and had landed at Cannes, 1 March.

The Return of Napoleon from Elba (1 March, 1815). — Although Napoleon's return had not been wholly unexpected, no proper precautions had been taken to meet it. He came with only four hundred of his guards, but thousands flocked to join him as he passed through France. The bulk of the soldiers and the lower classes had been sorely disappointed by the reactionary measures of the Bourbons, who, it is said, had learned nothing and forgotten nothing. Many, too, were drawn to his side by the sole magnetism of his presence, and, 20 March, he was once more in possession of Paris. The brief period of his supremacy is known as the "Hundred Days." United by pressing danger the Powers, who had been wrangling at Vienna, acted with energy, and with all possible speed the allied troops were massed on the frontier from the Low Countries to the Upper Rhine. To Wellington was assigned the command of the British, Hanoverian and Netherland contingents, amounting altogether to about 80,000 men, while the forces on the lower Rhine, numbering not far from 120,000, were placed under the Prussian Marshal Blücher. Wellington took up his headquarters at Brussels, while Blücher posted his main force at Namur with a line of defense stretching westward almost to the town of Ligny. Napoleon, whose total force amounted to 125,000 men, including 20,000 of the Imperial Guard, started from Paris, 7 June, planning to make a rapid dash into the Netherlands, to push between two forces opposed to him, to crush Blücher, and then to fall upon Wellington before reenforcements could reach him. Partly through his own fault, but more especially owing to the mistakes of his Marshals, his plan miscarried.

[1] Wellington had been created a duke at the close of the Peninsular war.

The Waterloo Campaign, Ligny and Quatre Bras (16 June, 1815). — The Waterloo campaign, extending from 16 to 18 June inclusive, consisted of the double battle of Ligny and Quatre Bras, fought on the 16th, of the main battle of Waterloo and a skirmish at Wavre on the 18th. Wellington, who had expected Napoleon to advance on Brussels, remained there until well into the night of the 15th with the bulk of his army. He had a smaller force at Quatre Bras, sixteen miles to the south. At half-past two on the afternoon of the 16th, Napoleon attacked Blücher, who had advanced the main body of his army to meet him at Ligny, situated six miles to the southeast of Quatre Bras. In a hot fight, which raged till evening, the Prussians were overwhelmed, but retreated in good order to Wavre some miles northward. On the same day, Marshal Ney was engaged in a furious battle with the Allies at Quatre Bras. He made two mistakes which had an important effect on the ultimate issue. For one thing, disregarding Napoleon's orders to stand merely on the defensive, he failed to furnish a contingent on which Napoleon counted to block Blücher's retreat from Ligny, a manœuvre that would have prevented the Prussians from reënforcing Wellington at Waterloo on the 18th. Ney's other mistake was in delaying his attack until Wellington had time to hurry sufficient troops from Brussels to repulse him. With all day before him — for the British reënforcements did not arrive till the evening of the 16th — he lost a golden opportunity of destroying the Prince of Orange's inferior force of Dutch and Belgians. Wellington, who, after his repulse of Ney, learned of the Prussian retreat from Ligny, drew off his own troops towards Brussels. Then Napoleon himself was responsible for two costly blunders. He should have hastened on the 17th to join Ney and overwhelm Wellington before Blücher could recover sufficiently to come to the assistance of the British commander. Not only did he fail to do so, but he also allowed himself to be deceived as to Blücher's line of retreat. Calculating that he would retire to his base of supplies at Namur he sent Marshal Grouchy eastward, while the Prussians were hurrying straight north. With the comfortable but erroneous hope that he had checkmated Blücher, Napoleon rested a whole day before attacking Wellington, who had taken a position just to the south of Waterloo.

The Battle of Waterloo (18 June, 1815). — Having detached a force of 17,000 to guard the approach to Brussels, Wellington was left with only 67,000, of whom less than 24,000 were British, to face 71,000 Frenchmen, most of them veterans of the Grand Army. His opponents were superior in cavalry and artillery as well, though their advantages were offset by the fact that they were scantily supplied with food.

Nevertheless, in the battle which Napoleon opened on the morning of 18 June, the British troops with magnificent steadfastness withstood the furious onslaughts of the French, even a final heroic charge of the Imperial Guard, until Blücher arrived to turn the scale. Grouchy, who finally discovered the real line of retreat of the Prussians, had reached Wavre too late to intercept any but a remnant. Aided by Blücher's reënforcements, the Allies, charging against the broken columns of the French, drove them from the field. The retreat became a rout, but the troops who had borne the heat and burden of the day left the pursuit to the Prussians, who never stopped until they had chased the fleeing Frenchmen across the Sambre. With all Europe arming against him, the ultimate triumph of Napoleon would doubtless have been impossible even had he won at Waterloo; but he might have prolonged the contest for some time longer. His defeat rendered immediate overthrow certain and was followed by forty years of peace. He abdicated for a second time, 22 June, while, in July, the Allies once more occupied Paris. Napoleon, after a vain effort to escape, surrendered on board the British ship *Bellerophon*. In agreement with the other Allied Powers the British Government sent him to the island of St. Helena, where he remained a prisoner till his death in 1821.

The British and the Congress of Vienna. The Quadruple Alliance (20 November, 1815).—The work of the Congress of Vienna in settling the general European situation was completed in June, though the boundaries of France were not definitely defined till the second Treaty of Paris, 20 November 1815.[1] Great Britain's territorial gains, though they excited the contempt of Napoleon, were considerable. They included Malta, Ceylon, the Cape of Good Hope, Mauritius, Trinidad, St. Lucia, Tobago, Heligoland, and the protectorate of the Ionian Islands. The Tsar got Austria and Prussia to sign, 26 September, a so-called Holy Alliance, which was a fantastic scheme for uniting all European rulers in bonds of Christian brotherhood and pledging them to mutual service for the preservation of the peace. All the Continental rulers, except the Pope and the Sultan, either joined or gave their approval to this "sonorous nothing," as Metternich, the Austrian Minister, described it. Since the leading British statesmen either had no sympathy with it[2] or positively distrusted it, Great Britain refused to become a party. It has sometimes been held responsible

[1] Reduced by the treaty of 1814 to the boundaries of 1792, they were now still further reduced to those of 1790. France was also forced to pay the Allies an indemnity of 700,000,000 francs.

[2] Castlereagh pronounced it a "piece of sublime mysticism and nonsense."

for the policy of repression which, under the guidance of Metternich, stifled all attempts at liberalism and nationalism in Europe for a number of years to come. That policy, however, was really due to the Quadruple Alliance, signed by Great Britain, Russia, Austria and Prussia, 20 November, 1815, by which they pledged themselves to intervene, in case of another revolution or usurpation which might threaten the tranquillity of any of the States. They also arranged for frequent Congresses which should consider such measures as might be necessary " for the maintenance of the peace of Europe."

ADDITIONAL READING FOR CHAPTERS XLV, XLVI, XLVII

Narrative. Hunt, *Political History*, chs. XIV–XX, and Brodrick and Fotheringham, *Political History of England, 1801–1837* (1906). Robertson, *England under the Hanoverians*. Sir H. Maxwell, *A Century of Empire* (vol. I, 1909), a conservative history of the nineteenth century; vol. I covers the period 1801–1822. *Cambridge Modern History*, VI. Lecky, *Eighteenth Century*, V, to 1793. Bright, *History of England*, III. J. H. Rose, *William Pitt and the National Revival* (1911) and *William Pitt and the Great War* (1911), the standard work on the younger Pitt and a notable contribution to the general history of the period; very favorable to Pitt. For further authorities dealing with the years 1784–1815, see Hunt, 459–469; Brodrick and Fotheringham, 443–450; Robertson, 517–532, and *Cambridge Modern History*, VI, 902–912, and VIII, 791 ff., dealing with the French Revolution in general, and IX, 773 ff., dealing primarily with the Napoleonic Wars.

India. Bright, III, 1113–1134, contains a good survey of India from 1600 to 1784, see also Seeley's *Expansion of England*, pt. II. A. D. Innes, *A Short History of the British in India* (1902). A. C. Lyall, *The Rise and Expansion of the British Dominion in India* (5th ed., 1910). The best apology for Warren Hastings is to be found in G. W. Hastings, *Vindication of Warren Hastings* (1909) and should be contrasted with Macaulay's famous essays on Hastings. For further references in India, see *Cambridge Modern History*, VI, 925–932; Robertson, 523, 530; Hunt, 468; Brodrick and Fotheringham, 449. See also chs. LVII and LX below.

Ireland. O'Connor Morris, *Ireland, 1494–1905* (2d ed., R. Dunlop, 1909). Lecky, *Ireland, in the Eighteenth Century*, I–V. Froude, *The English in Ireland*. T. D. Ingram, *Critical Examination of Irish History* (2 vols., 1900) and *History of the Irish Union* (1887) an attempt to justify the English methods. For further references see *Cambridge Modern History*, VI (913–924), VIII (878–882); Hunt, 468, Robertson, 521–22. See Turner and Joyce already cited.

French Revolution. Lecky, VI. J. H. Rose, *The Revolutionary and Napoleonic Era* (1901). H. M. Stephens, *European History, 1789–1815* (1900). L. H. Holt and A. W. Chilton, *A Brief History of Europe, 1789–1815* (1919). For further references see *Cambridge Modern History*, VIII,

791 ff., especially 791–793. For the Napoleonic Era, J. H. Rose, *Napoleon* (2 vols., 1902, 1 vol. ed., 1907). Lanfrey, *History of Napoleon I.* (Eng. tr. 4 vols., 1871–79) incomplete, very hostile to Napoleon. For further references see *Cambridge Modern History*, IX, 773 ff., especially 773–786.

Military and Naval. Fortescue, *British Army*, III–VIII, to 1812. Sir W. Napier, *History of the War in the Peninsula* (6 vols., 1834–1840). C. Oman, *History of the Peninsular War* (vols. I–IV to 1811, 1902–1911) and *Wellington's Army, 1809–1814* (1913). J. C. Ropes, *The Campaign of Waterloo* (1892–3). Mahan, *Influence of Sea Power upon the French Revolution* (2 vols., 1893); *Life of Nelson* (2 vols., 1897); and *Sea Power in its Relation to the War of 1812* (2 vols., 1905).

Biographies and Special Works. G. Pellew, *Life and Correspondence of Lord Sidmouth (Addington)* (3 vols., 1847). Rosebery, *William Pitt* (1891). W. Sichel, *Sheridan* (2 vols., 1909). R. and S. Wilberforce, *Life of William Wilberforce* (5 vols., 1839). A. G. Stapleton, *The Political Life of George Canning* (3 vols., 1831); *George Canning and His Friends* (ed. J. F. Bagot, 2 vols., 1909); good short *Lives* are those by H. W. V. Temperly (1905) and J. A. R. Marriott (1903). Sir H. Maxwell, *The Life of Wellington* (2 vols., 1899). W. T. Laprade, *England and the French Revolution* (1909). W. T. Hall, *British Radicalism, 1791–1797* (1912). P. A. Brown, *The Influence of the French Revolution in English History* (1918). Fortescue, *British Statesmen of the Great War, 1793–1814* (1911) marked by strong prejudices.

Selections from the sources. Adams and Stephens, nos. 256–259. Robertson, *Select Statutes*, pt. I, nos. XXXVIII–XLIII; pt. II, XXII–XXIV.

CHAPTER XLVIII

FROM THE OVERTHROW OF NAPOLEON TO THE EVE OF THE GREAT REFORM BILL. THE LAST YEARS OF GEORGE III AND THE REIGN OF GEORGE IV (1815–1830)

The Period from 1815 to 1830. — The close of the War was hailed in England with general rejoicing. The dominant Tory party nourished the comfortable assurance that their aristocratic privileges, which the French had threatened to subvert, were now secure. With the cessation of the drain of heavy war taxes and the end of the vexatious Continental System, the masses hoped for a return of prosperity and contentment. Instead, the peace, which only the farmers had dreaded, was marked, during its first few years, by discontent, agitation, violence and repression. Happily this grievous state of affairs did not last very long; for economic conditions began to improve, manifestations of popular unrest ceased for a time, and far-reaching reforms were undertaken which profoundly changed the industrial, social, religious, and political system. The Industrial Revolution, beginning in the previous century, had produced a great body of wealthy merchants, manufacturers and traders who were bound to demand an increasing share in the control of public affairs. Moreover, the principle of equality promulgated by the French Revolution acted as an inevitable stimulus, so soon as the danger from France had been overcome and the unrest in England had been quieted. Yet, while the humbler folk gained something by these changes, they represented in a large degree a triumph of the middle classes.

The Political Situation at the Close of the War. — Lord Liverpool, Premier from 1812 until 1827, was only nominal head of the Government, occupied chiefly in trying to induce his Ministers to work in harmony. The real directors of the Cabinet policy, during the half dozen years following the close of the Great War, were Viscount Castlereagh, Foreign Secretary and Leader of the House of Commons, and Lord Chancellor Eldon, whose régime was marked by legislative stagnation and the repression of all popular demands. The Whig

Opposition was torn by internal divisions between conservatives and the Radicals [1] and discredited by the hot zeal of the latter. Nevertheless, divided and discountenanced as they were, they manfully raised their voice against the dominant oligarchy and cried for "peace, retrenchment and reform." They accused the Government of designing to maintain an expensive establishment in order to aid Continental Sovereigns in the suppression of popular rights, and of reckless extravagance in other respects. The first charge was, to some degree, justified by the aims of the Quadruple Alliance to which Great Britain was a party; the second was even more well founded. The War had fostered a spirit of wastefulness which the example of the Regent, who regarded himself as the "first gentleman in Europe," further encouraged. The public debt had climbed to over £860,000,000, bearing an annual interest of more than £32,000,000, while George every year spent more than twice the sum allotted to him in the Civil List.

Industrial Depression and Distress among the People. — The thriftlessness of the Government and the upper classes was all the more indefensible since, in place of the expected prosperity, the country had to face a period of acute distress. During the War British manufactures and commerce had thriven, owing to the successful evasion of trade restrictions, to the effective protection rendered by the British navy, and to the enormous demand for clothes, food, and munitions of war to support the armies and the fleets. The pressure of military necessity and the dangers involved in the traffic had forced prices up to dizzy heights. With the advent of peace, inflated prices dropped to their normal level. Continental countries, so long devastated by war, bought as little as possible and sought to build up their own shattered industries. Moreover, the reduction of the army and navy to a peace footing flooded the country with men seeking employment. Owing to the increasing use of labor-saving machinery there was little or no opportunity in the industries, while a bad harvest in 1816 threw numbers of agricultural laborers out of work. Widespread distress led to alarming outbursts of violence — to rick-burning and machine-breaking, while the authorities, who attributed all this to revolutionary spirit rather than to misery, resorted to coercive legislation and repression instead of seeking remedies to alleviate the causes of discontent. The only excuse for their attitude was the fact that political agitators were busy inflaming the mob in addresses and pamphlets. Radicals were of all grades: some were "visionary and sincere," some were "unprincipled and

[1] This group got its name from its advocacy of "radical reform."

self-seeking," some were socialists, others looked merely toward political reform. The man who exercised perhaps the greatest influence was William Cobbett, through the medium of his *Weekly Political Register*, and he, even though some of his demands were wildly extreme, was not in favor of violence at all. Yet hide-bound Tory Ministers lumped the Radicals, violent and peaceful, frenzied and sensible, without discrimination, as revolutionists. Many, even of the Whigs, sought to clear their skirts of contamination by violent denunciation of those who held more advanced views than themselves. Pitt had at least this justification for repression, that he had to deal with revolutionary agitators looking for aid to the men and arms of France. Now there was no such danger: " not Jacobin theories, but economic and social facts were the real causes of the disturbances " which filled the winter of 1816–1817.

The Disturbances of 1816–1817. The Repressive Policy of the Government.— Plans were made for a great demonstration, 2 December, 1816, but the mob, after doing some damage and causing some bloodshed, was easily dispersed. In February, 1817, the Regent's carriage was attacked on his return from the opening of Parliament. Fearing that a design existed to subvert existing institutions and to distribute or destroy all private property, the Government, thereupon, launched a series of repressive measures. A new Seditious Meetings Bill was passed;[1] the Habeas Corpus Act was again suspended,[2] and the local magistrates were ordered to seize all persons charged with publishing or writing seditious or blasphemous literature. The most serious manifestation of discontent was the " Derbyshire Insurrection," in which armed rioters, forcing the more peacefully inclined to join their ranks, terrorized the neighborhood. The magnitude and danger of this and other outbreaks was greatly exaggerated by a Government agent, known as " Oliver the Spy." Doubtless, too, he helped to stir up risings for his own purposes, though it is not true, as some believed at the time, that the Government encouraged him in this sort of thing; nevertheless, the authorities were all too ready to see evidences of organized conspiracy in isolated outbreaks. Moreover, they went altogether too far, in most instances, in charging the accused with treason. The juries were with the people, so that, except in the case of Derbyshire rioters, three of whom were sentenced to death and several to transportation, no convictions were secured. While this tended to bring the authorities into contempt, the manifestations

[1] The measure of 1795 had been limited in duration.

[2] The suspension lasted till 1818. Since that date the suspension has never been repeated in England.

of 1816–1817 proved very disastrous to the Whig party. Those who sided with the repressive policy lost their influence with the masses, while those who showed popular sympathy were shunned by moderate men as dangerous radicals.

The "Peterloo," or Manchester Massacre (1819). — Owing to a temporary return of better times comparative quiet prevailed in 1818; but, in 1819, another bad harvest, together with renewed industrial depression, brought fresh trouble. The agitation for parliamentary reform reached a fever heat. In Manchester, which did not enjoy the privilege of sending regular members to Parliament, an enormous meeting was planned for 16 August to choose a "legislative representative." Although the magistrate declined to authorize the proposed meeting, 50,000 people assembled in St. Peter's Fields bearing banners with: "Equal representation or death," and similar inscriptions. In an attempt to arrest the speaker who was to address the meeting, the magistrates, losing their heads, ordered the mounted soldiery to charge the crowd. As a result, five or six were killed and about fifty wounded. Rumor, however, greatly exaggerated the number, and popular sentiment was bitter. The affair is known to history as the "Manchester" or "Peterloo Massacre." Parliament, directly it met, passed a series of measures, known as the "Six Acts," reviving and extending the temporary legislation of 1817. The first two, empowering the magistrates to seize arms and to prevent military training for unlawful purposes, as well as the third, designed to secure speedy trials, were justifiable. The fourth, providing for the punishment of publishers of seditious libels and the seizure of their works, was not long enforced and was repealed in 1830. The fifth, aimed at publications like Cobbett's "two-penny trash,"[1] imposed a stamp duty on small pamphlets.[2] The sixth act was the most burdensome of all. Prohibiting meetings in corporate towns and counties unless summoned by the Mayor and the Lord Lieutenant respectively, it fell with peculiar heaviness on towns like Manchester, which, since they were unrepresented in Parliament, were thus practically deprived of their only means of voicing their grievances. Happily the duration of the Acts was limited to five years. Once more, economic conditions improved, and there was little manifestation of popular discontent for some time to come.

The End of the Regency (1820). The Accession and Character of George IV. — George III died, 29 January, 1820, after lingering on for a decade as a blind and imbecile wreck. George IV, as his suc-

[1] His *Political Register*, which sold for *2d.*

[2] A similar tax on newspapers had been in force since Queen Anne's time.

cessor now came to be called, had reached his fifty-eighth year. His manners, when he chose, were gracious and winning; but he never acquired any stability of character, he never shook off those vices for which he was so notorious in his youth. Moreover, his word could never be trusted; he was mean and treacherous to his father, to his wife, to his daughter, and to his subjects. More wicked Kings have reigned over England, but none who was more contemptible. One service only the country owes him; just because he was so despicable, the growth of the personal power of the Sovereign, which his father had done so much to revive, received a decided check.

Queen Caroline and Her History (1795–1820). — In the first year of his reign, George and his Ministers had to face a crisis growing out of the King's relations with his unfortunate Queen Caroline. The Ministry weathered the storm which threatened its destruction; but the loyalty and respect of the middle classes for the Sovereign and his supporters were shaken beyond recovery. Caroline, daughter of the Duke of Brunswick, had been forced into this ill-starred marriage against her will 8 April, 1795, while the Prince had consented [1] solely because it was the only condition on which Parliament would vote to pay his debts. Her good qualities he could not appreciate, and her frivolity, her indiscretions, and lack of breeding shocked his fastidious nature. They separated in 1796, though she continued to live in the neighborhood of London until 1814, when she went abroad. Her manner of life was at least questionable, and, in 1818, the Regent sent over a secret committee to secure evidence for a divorce; but it was the Queen herself who finally forced the issue. Already smarting from the humiliation of receiving no official recognition at foreign courts, she was stung to fury when her name was omitted from the new Prayer Book issued at the accession of her royal Consort.[2] So in June, 1820, she started for England to appeal to the people and to plead her cause in person. Public chivalry was aroused in the cause of a woman who, whatever her faults, had been despitefully treated by one who was a notorious evil liver, while the Whig politicians rallied to her support as a means of striking both at the party in power and the King who had deserted them.

The Struggle over Her Divorce (1820). — After Caroline had refused any concession on the two essential points — her formal recogni-

[1] In 1785 he had married secretly Mrs. Fitzherbert, a widow of Roman Catholic faith; but the match was held to be illegal, because contrary to the provisions of the Royal Marriage Act. She was ultimately awarded a pension and lived till 1837.

[2] It is customary to insert a prayer for the King and Queen by name.

tion at foreign courts and the insertion of her name in the Prayer Book — Lord Liverpool introduced a bill to deprive her of her title and to divorce her from King George; but in the face of a steadily dwindling majority, the Prime Minister finally withdrew the measure. The news was hailed with tumults of joy, and London was illuminated for three nights. Thus encouraged, Caroline continued the fight; yet she failed to get her name in the Prayer Book. Further, she failed in a frantic effort to have herself crowned with the King, and alienated many by committing the fatal blunder of making an undignified attempt to force her way into Westminster Abbey on coronation day, 19 July, 1821. She did not long survive her disappointment; for she died, 7 August, much to the relief of King George.

The Advent of the Liberal Tories (1822). — While Liverpool's Tory Ministry hung on till 1827, its character was profoundly modified in 1822. Napoleon, disturber of the peace of Europe, was dead, popular outbreaks had ceased, and the middle class, relieved from fear of invasion or revolution, were prepared to demand more freedom of commerce, a greater voice in public affairs, and, in general, a resumption of the work of reform in which Pitt had been so rudely interrupted. The Queen's cause had served as a means of focusing and manifesting their strength, and had made it clear to the tyrannical clique who had thus far clung so stoutly to the existing system, that at least some degree of concession was necessary. In consequence they took the momentous step of admitting into the Cabinet four liberal Tories, who forthwith set on foot a series of legislative and administrative changes which opened a new era.

Peel, Canning, and Huskisson. — In January, 1822, Robert Peel (1788–1850), who was destined for a remarkable future, became Home Secretary. On 12 August Castlereagh[1] committed suicide. Contemptuous of popular aspiration and stifler of progress though he was, it should not be forgotten that he was largely responsible for the effective reorganization of the British army and for the Peninsular campaign, that he selected and supported Wellington, that he headed the combination of Powers that overcame Napoleon and played a leading rôle in shaping the peace which, though all too regardless of liberty and nationality, averted another European conflict for fifty years. George Canning (1770–1827), who succeeded him as Foreign Secretary and Leader of the House of Commons, was brilliant, versatile, progressive, and doubtless one of the most eloquent orators and one of the most skillful debaters and parliamentary managers of the century. Many, however, distrusted his sincerity and his judgment. William

[1] He had succeeded his father as Marquis of Londonderry in 1821.

Huskisson (1770–1830), who became President of the Board of Trade, though his abilities were only slowly recognized, was the greatest authority of his time in finance, trade, and commerce. Canning, burdened with the double weight of the home and foreign policy of his country, depended much upon his new colleagues for initial suggestions and the working out of details in domestic reforms. The remedial legislation which they undertook covered all sorts of fields — legal, judicial, social, colonial, commercial, and industrial. While great strides were made during the next few years, much remained for later generations to perfect and complete.

The Beginning of Huskisson's Reforms. His Colonial Policy. — In 1823 Huskisson substantially modified the operation of the Navigation Laws, though they were not actually repealed till 1849. By a Reciprocity of Duties Bill, European countries were allowed a share in the British Colonial trade, subject to certain restrictions, provided they would extend equal privileges to Great Britain.[1] Contrary to the prevailing notion that the British Colonial system was a monopoly belonging to the Mother Country because of the protection and defense which she rendered, Huskisson declared that the trade interests of the Colonies deserved consideration and that they were inseparably bound up with those of England. The Home trader continued to receive a certain preference in tariffs; but Colonial commerce and immigration were systematically fostered. While some abuses persisted, Huskisson's wise and generous policy aroused a sentiment of loyalty in the Colonies hitherto unequaled.

His Tariff and Taxation Reforms. — In this same year Great Britain, doubtless owing to Huskisson's suggestion, was finally relieved of that old incubus the Sinking Fund. Henceforth, it was provided that no additions were to be made to the Sinking Fund except from the surplus for the year. Huskisson proceeded, in 1824, to grapple with the whole existing system of tariffs and taxation. Much as Pitt had done to unravel the tangle, hosts of anomalies remained. Furthermore, many new taxes had been imposed in a more or less random fashion to meet the needs of a war revenue. There were bounties to assist old and decrepit industries, while those that were young and growing received no support. Many productions, propped up by bounties, were in turn weighed down by a heavy excise. Furthermore, trade and manufactures were hampered by vexatious duties. Huskisson was in principle a free trader. Convinced that bounties and prohibitive restrictions fostered unprofitable industries and discouraged invention and progress, he abolished as many as he could, and pro-

[1] The United States had secured similar concessions in 1814

vided for the gradual doing away with many more. At the same time, he swept away various unproductive taxes, revising others or distributing them more equally. In remodeling the tariff he followed the plan of leaving a slight duty to protect the manufacturer, as well as further to assist him by making raw materials as free as possible. The old duties ranged from 18 to 40 per cent, those which Huskisson substituted, from 15 to 30. The loss of revenue due to reduction in taxes was, to a large degree, offset by increase of trade as well as by the future suppression of smuggling, which the old duties had encouraged. Much as Huskisson's measures contributed to the striking increase in exports and shipping which followed, other causes were, to a still greater degree, operative. The Spanish-American colonies threw off the yoke of Spain and opened their trade freely to the world. The Portuguese possession of Brazil, which became an independent empire in 1822, did the like. Moreover, commercial relations with the United States steadily improved after the War of 1812. And, finally, the recovery of the European Continent from its exhaustion affected England as a buyer, as a seller, and as a distributing agent.

His Combination Laws (1824–1825). — Huskisson was also responsible for various measures regulating and improving the conditions of the working classes and their relations with the capitalists. Laws forbidding the exportation of machinery and the emigration of laborers, which it had always been difficult to enforce, were abolished. In 1824 he passed an Act allowing peaceful workingmen to meet without penalty, and, indeed, legalizing every sort of combination. This step, however, had to be partially retraced the following year; for, owing to a temporary return of hard times, a number of disturbances and riots broke out. In consequence, a new Act was passed in 1825 forbidding certain kinds of meetings and empowering the magistrates to deal in a summary fashion with either employers or workmen who resorted to threats or intimidation.

Canning's Ministry (**April–August, 1827**). — On 17 February, 1827, a stroke of paralysis brought Lord Liverpool's long career as Prime Minister to a sudden end. For some time his tact alone had held the two factions in the Cabinet together, for they had practically nothing in common except opposition to parliamentary reform. Now a split was inevitable. The progressive section led by Canning, which stood for aiding subject nationalities abroad and for Catholic emancipation and the extension of free trade at home, had a majority in the Commons, while the chief strength of the old Eldonian Tories was in the House of Lords. Canning was the logical successor as Premier, but

he was broken in health and bitterly opposed by the King, partly because of his advanced views and partly because he had championed the cause of Queen Caroline. Wellington declined the post, and after the Government had been six weeks without a head, George finally gave in. Canning, during the few months that he survived, had to fight against tremendous odds. The chief struggle centered about an attempt to substitute for an Act of 1815, prohibiting the import of foreign corn free of duty until the domestic price had reached 80 shillings the quarter, a measure providing for a sliding scale of duties which went down as the price went up. The artisans and the agricultural laborers — who worked for hire — clamored for cheap food, and the manufacturers supported the change, since dear food meant high wages. In the teeth of the opposition of the landlords and of the farmers — burdened with exorbitant rents and excessive poor rates — the measure passed the Commons, but was blocked in the Lords by a hostile amendment.

The Roman Catholic Question. — Canning died, 8 August, 1827, and after a transient and futile Ministry, the only one in English history which never faced a Parliament, the Duke of Wellington, backed by the landed interest and the rigid Protestants, became Premier on the understanding that Roman Catholic relief — for which there was a growing demand — was not to be made a Cabinet question. The Roman Catholic disabilities and penal laws, which only began to be mitigated in the last quarter of the eighteenth century, exhibited a harshness and an ingenuity of cruelty and oppression which even the circumstances that called them forth cannot justify. By the Acts of 1562 and 1678 Roman Catholics were excluded from both Houses of Parliament, by the Test Act all public offices, civil and military, were closed to them, and by an Act of 1696 they were even deprived of the right to vote. Such were their political disabilities. In addition, they were subject to penal laws which if enforced would have rendered their position well-nigh intolerable. It should be said, however, that as the danger from papal aggression and Jacobitism disappeared and as rationalism and religious indifference began to spread, the penal laws ceased to be enforced. These "ferocious threats" were mostly effaced from the Statute-book in 1778 and 1791; but the political disabilities remained.

The Struggle for Catholic Emancipation. Daniel O'Connell. — Pitt, as has been seen, failed to secure further measures of Catholic relief in fulfillment of the pledges given to carry the Union. Various other enlightened statesmen championed the cause in Parliament; but the only fruit of years of struggle was the Military and Naval

Officers' Oath Bill of 1817, opening all ranks in the service to Roman Catholics. At the same time the agitation was being actively carried on in Ireland. The old agrarian difficulties — absenteeism, rack-renting and tithes — still lay at the root of the discontent of the lesser folk; but their leaders pushed to the front the question of the political disabilities — exclusion from office and Parliament. Their most skillful organizer and agitator was Daniel O'Connell, a Roman Catholic barrister, whose knowledge of his countrymen, coupled with wit, eloquence, and fervid enthusiasm, made him a popular idol. Organized societies and mass meetings were molded by his masterly hand into perfect and responsive instruments, and no one did more than he to arouse a truly national feeling. Although often violent in his language he always opposed the use of force, declaring on one occasion that "no political change is worth a drop of human blood." In 1823 he founded the Catholic Association for peaceful and public agitation of grievances. When the Government in alarm passed a bill aiming to declare illegal not only this but all societies for similar objects, the resourceful O'Connell forthwith founded a new association which evaded the terms of the Act.

The Repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts. The Clare Election (1828). — In 1828, Lord John Russell, destined to become one of the Whig leaders, carried through Parliament a measure for repealing the provisions in the Test and Corporation Acts, which required as a qualification for office, the taking of the sacrament according to the Anglican form. Thus the Protestant Dissenters were admitted to privileges which they had enjoyed hitherto only by an ungracious indemnity. Catholics were still excluded by the necessity of taking the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy,[1] but their victory was not far off. During this same year there was a by-election for Parliament in the county Clare. O'Connell became a candidate, to the amazement of everybody, for, even if elected, he was disqualified from sitting. In a five days' contest in which he and the priests took care that the proceedings should be absolutely peaceful, he won a complete triumph. The outcome of the election convinced Wellington that political equality could no longer be withheld from the Roman Catholics except at the risk of civil war.

The Passage of the Roman Catholic Emancipation Bill (1829). — Any other Prime Minister would have resigned. By remaining in

[1] By the Act of 1828 a new declaration for the protection of the Church of England was required from all holders of any office, employment, or place of trust. Since it had to be affirmed "upon the true faith of a Christian," Jews were excluded, not only from office but from Parliament.

office and bending all his energies to carry the measure he was pledged to oppose, the Duke was furiously denounced by the old line Tories as a betrayer of their principles. Although his courage and honesty were above question, he failed to understand the English party system. His political tactics were those of the general — to hold a position as long as possible and then to yield; moreover, he had a sense of public duty that was superior to party allegiance. Convinced that delay was fatal he realized that no one in the country was as likely as himself to overcome the obstinacy of the King. After notice had already been given that the Bill would be introduced, King George sought to interpose an obstacle by declaring that he would consent to no alteration in the Oath of Supremacy. Wellington at once resigned, and, finding it impossible to form another Ministry, George was obliged to give way. The measure passed the House of Commons, and poor old Eldon, though he shed tears and foretold the ruin of the British Empire, failed to induce the majority of the Tory peers to vote against it. While the King reluctantly signed the measure he vented his spite by treating its supporters with premeditated rudeness and by showering favors upon those who had opposed it.

The Terms of the Act. — The Act conceded full political and civil rights to Roman Catholics, with certain specified exceptions and under certain conditions devised as safeguards. The Oaths of Allegiance, Supremacy, and Abjuration were done away with, as well as the renunciation of belief in transubstantiation, invocation of saints, and the sacrifice of the mass. Instead, members of Parliament and office holders had to take a new oath swearing allegiance to the Sovereign, renouncing the temporal supremacy of the Pope within the realm, and pledging support to the Protestant settlement of Church and State. Priests were prohibited from sitting in Parliament[1] and Roman Catholics were excluded from the offices of Sovereign, Lord Chancellor of England or Ireland, and Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. These concessions — a tardy measure of justice — did not have the hoped-for effect in quieting the Irish discontent; indeed, Wellington's frank admission in the House of Lords that he had only acted from dread of civil war, encouraged the use of force in time to come. Two further reasons help to explain the dissatisfaction. For one thing, because so many had voted so boldly in the recent Clare election, the forty-shilling freeholders were disfranchised and the qualification for voting raised to ten pounds. Moreover, apparently for the express

[1] Church of England clergymen had been excluded from the House of Commons since 1801. A few disabilities still remained; for example, marriages celebrated by Catholic priests were not recognized by law till 1838.

purpose of excluding O'Connell, the Government had unwisely inserted a clause in the Relief Bill that its provisions should not be retroactive. O'Connell appeared at the bar of the House prepared to take the new oath, but, though he argued his case with moderation and skill, was turned away. He was easily reëlected; but the senseless and ungracious trick which had been practiced on him turned him into a fiery advocate of the repeal of the Union.

The Last Months of the Wellington Ministry, and the Death of George IV. — The last months of the Wellington Ministry were gloomy enough, for the Duke and his supporters never recovered their popularity. The Tories regarded them as traitors, the King never forgave them for forcing his hand, while the Canningites were hopelessly alienated, and as a matter of fact, most of them went over to the Whigs, who were once more becoming strongly organized. Another factor which told against Wellington was that parliamentary reform, to which he was stoutly opposed, had now become an issue bound to prevail. George IV died, 26 June, 1830, unloved and unregretted. With the accession of his brother William, who was friendly to reform, the Duke's Ministry was doomed. Events abroad, which reached a crisis in 1830, gave great impetus to the popular movement in England.

Great Britain and the European Situation at the Close of the Great War. — The effect of the French Revolution and of the Napoleonic Wars had been, on the one hand, to arouse a spirit of liberty and national independence among the peoples of many Continental States, on the other, to unite most of the European Sovereigns in a policy of reaction and repression. The chief engine for carrying through this work was the Quadruple Alliance, which provided for frequent Congresses, where all movements which threatened the tranquillity of Europe were discussed, and concerted action determined. Prince Metternich, the Austrian Minister, was the leading spirit of the despotic régime. While he was opposed to any intervention which might disturb the balance of power, he induced the larger States of Germany to combine under Prussian leadership for the purpose of aiding the lesser to stifle the least signs of revolution; he stood ready to crush out all evidences of unrest in Italy, where through the possession of Lombardy and Venice, Austrian interests were predominant; and he was pledged to maintain the Bourbons of France. Castlereagh, who guided British foreign policy, was a far more decided advocate of non-intervention, while Alexander of Russia represented the opposite policy.

A Year of Revolutions (1820). — The year 1820 witnessed a series of revolutions. The first occurred in Spain. Though Alexander was

hot for joint intervention, Castlereagh, backed by Metternich, succeeded in frustrating his designs. In the summer, revolts followed in Naples, Sicily, and Portugal. Castlereagh was quite willing to allow Austria to interfere in Italy, on the ground that her possessions were endangered; but he declared against proposals of joint intervention. He was really in sympathy with crushing revolutionary movements, and seems to have given the European Powers private assurances of support, though he played, to satisfy British public opinion, a double game by openly opposing their efforts. The upshot was that Austria sent an army to Naples which restored the deposed King and likewise suppressed a revolt which had broken out in Piedmont. Thus, with the help of Castlereagh, she carried out a policy of intervention when it suited her interests, and defeated the Russian project for joint action, which she regarded with disfavor.

The Spanish Situation (1820–1823). — The situation in Spain was complicated from the fact that the ultra-royalists, who had secured control in France, fearing the contagion of the Spanish revolutionary principles, insisted upon intervention. Castlereagh, before his death, 12 August, 1822, had already made up his mind to resist the French as he had previously resisted the Russian proposals of intervention, and Canning, his successor as Foreign Secretary, adopted the same attitude; where he differed from his predecessor was in his sincere belief that each nation should be left free to choose its own form of government, and he acted with an energy that was in striking contrast to the half-heartedness of the late Foreign Secretary. In spite of the efforts of Wellington, who was sent as plenipotentiary to a Congress at Verona, the project of French intervention was adopted, and Canning finally agreed not to interfere with the invaders so long as they observed certain conditions: they should not destroy the independence of Spain; France should not possess herself of any Spanish colonies; and the occupation should not be permanent. A French army entered Spain in April, 1823. Before the close of the year the Revolution was suppressed and absolutism was again triumphant.

Canning and the Recognition of the South American Republics (1823–1825). — In more than one other direction, however, Canning contributed to check the reactionaries, notably in the Portuguese and Spanish colonies in America, and in Greece. In October, 1822, Pedro, son of the King of Portugal, proclaimed the independence of Brazil and assumed the title of Emperor, a step which was recognized by the Portuguese Sovereign, July, 1825, in accordance with the recommendations of a conference in London composed of British,

Austrian, Portuguese, and Brazilian representatives. Already, in January, 1825, Great Britain, following the lead of the United States, had recognized the independence of Mexico and of two of the republics in South America where revolutions against Spain had been going on since 1810. The possibility of European intervention was prevented by the efforts of Canning and the United States. While the American Secretary of State, John Quincy Adams, declined the proposals of the British Foreign Minister for joint action, Monroe, in his famous presidential message of December, 1823, declared, in substance, that interference on the part of any European Power with American Governments, whose independence had been maintained and recognized by the United States, would be regarded in the light of an unfriendly act.[1] Thus supported, Canning was able to prevent France from calling in the other Powers to undertake the reconquest of the Spanish colonies. In phrases which have become famous, Canning declared in Parliament: "Contemplating Spain such as our ancestors had known her, I resolved that if France had Spain, it should not be Spain with the Indies. I called the New World in existence, to redress the balance of the old." As a matter of fact, he called nothing into existence; he merely recognized States that had already accomplished their independence and took the step after the United States had led the way. Nevertheless, the significance of his achievement must not be forgotten. In the face of a great European combination and of the opposition of King George, backed by a strong party in the Cabinet, he had arrayed his country on the side of revolutionary Governments against the forces of reaction.

Canning and the Greek Revolution (1823–1827). — In eastern Europe also, where a different problem had to be faced, Canning adopted the cause of an insurgent people. In 1821 the Greeks had risen in revolt against the Turks, to whom they had long been subject. Here, too, Russia was keen for intervention, but this time on the side of the oppressed nationality. Popular sentiment in Great Britain was naturally inclined to favor the Greeks, while Castlereagh opposed the Russian projects on two grounds. He feared the encouragement it might lend to the revolutionary spirit which was spreading through Europe, and he feared, still more, that defeat of the Turks by Russian arms would lead to Russian supremacy in the Black Sea

[1] The sentences in which this view was expressed, as well as those aimed against the designs of Russia on the northwest coast, which announced that: "the American Continents . . . are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European Power," were written by Adams. The doctrine which they embody has been rightly called the "Monroe Doctrine," in that Monroe assumed the responsibility. It was the enunciation of a principle as old as Washington.

and Asia Minor, and to a consequent menace of the British power in the Mediterranean and in India. While Canning had no sympathy with the first consideration, the question of Russian aggrandizement presented a serious problem in his eyes. He did not hesitate to recognize the Greeks as belligerents, 25 March, 1823; but, for some time, he stood out against acknowledging their independence or intervening with force of arms on their behalf, and sought to secure concessions from the Turks by mediation. He was only forced to contemplate intervention by the furious devastation and bloodshed of Ibrahim Pasha, son of Mehemet Ali, ruler of Egypt, whom the Sultan called in to reduce Morea. Popular enthusiasm for the Greek cause in England and elsewhere was tremendous. Volunteers flocked to the scene of action, and money and supplies were joyfully contributed. Canning, who continued his policy of cautious restraint, signed, 6 July, 1827, just before his final illness, the Treaty of London, which aimed to secure autonomy for the Greeks, coupled with the payment of tribute to the Sultan. In the event of Turkey's refusal, the allied fleets of Great Britain, France and Russia were to combine in enforcing the terms.

Triumph of Greek Independence (1829). — The reply of the Porte was to order a fleet from Egypt which took its station in the harbor of Navarino under the command of Ibrahim. Thence he landed troops, harried the land and massacred the inhabitants at will. This was too much for Admiral Codrington, the commander of the allied squadron, who entered the harbor, 20 October, 1827, and inflicted a crushing defeat upon his adversaries. Canning, who might have supported him, was no more, while Wellington, who soon became Premier, was disinclined to break with Turkey in the interests of the Greeks. Hence Codrington's noble victory was described in the King's speech of 29 January, 1828, as "a collision wholly unexpected by his Majesty," and "an untoward event," which "his Majesty hoped would not be followed by further hostilities." This declaration, which raised a storm of protest on the part of the friends of Greek freedom, encouraged Turkey to demand satisfaction for the destruction of her fleet. When this insolent demand was refused, she proceeded to defy all Europe, and Russia in particular, whom she denounced as the prime mover in the Greek revolt. Russia, thereupon, declared war and moved her troops into the Danubian provinces. In vain she urged Great Britain and France to send their fleets through the Dardanelles, though at length, the Conference of London, which had resumed its sittings, agreed that the French should undertake the expulsion of Ibrahim. Meanwhile, Codrington, who had been recalled, sailed to

Alexandria before the order went to effect, and extorted an agreement from Mehemet Ali to withdraw the greater part of the Egyptian fleet. This greatly simplified the work of the French in driving the invaders from the coast, while the Greeks carried on the war with the greatest vigor, and the Russians pressed down over the Balkans. It soon became clear, however, that they had got themselves into a dangerous position, whereupon the Tsar hastened to make terms. Peace was signed, 14 September, 1829, and Turkey consented to submit the decision of the Greek question to the Conference of London. As a result it was provided that Greece should be erected into an hereditary Principality, independent of the Porte.

The Year of Revolutions (1830). The Three Days' Rising in Paris (27–29 July). — The year 1830 was notable for a series of revolutionary movements, in which France, for the second time, led the way. Louis XIII died in 1824 and was succeeded by his brother Charles X who, with his Ministers, developed a policy of reaction which aroused intense opposition. The result was a revolt which took the form of a three days' street fight in Paris, 27–29 July. Charles X was driven from the throne and Louis Philippe — a descendant of the Duke of Orleans, brother of Louis XIV — was proclaimed King. Wellington, convinced of the pacific policy of the new "Citizen King," secured his recognition and choked in its inception a hostile combination of Austria, Russia, and Prussia.

The Belgian Revolution (1830). — The effect of the French revolutionary movement was first manifested in the neighboring Belgium, formerly the Austrian Netherlands. The Belgians had sorely chafed under the rule of the Dutch King William I, who had been set over them by the Congress of Vienna; they were French in sympathy, they were Roman Catholics and chiefly engaged in manufacturing pursuits. The Dutch, who were the dominant partners in the united Kingdom, were anti-French, stanch Protestants, and mainly commercial in their interests. Furthermore, they controlled the States General and held a large share of the public offices, while, in addition, the King alienated his Belgian subjects and roused their resentment by a series of encroachments: among other things suspending the liberty of the press, and proscribing the use of French in public business. Following the revolt in Paris a popular rising took place in Brussels, 25 August, 1830, whence it spread through the provinces. At first the insurgents asked only for a separate administration, but national sentiment soon came to demand the abolition of the personal union. While the Powers, assembled at the London Conference to settle the Greek question, went to work discussing boundaries, and

the form of government which the Belgians should adopt, a Belgian National Congress had assembled, which proclaimed the independence of Belgium, voted for a constitutional Monarchy, and elected as King the second son of Louis Philippe. Since the Powers objected to this choice, the crown was afterwards tendered to Leopold of Saxe-Coburg, who accepted in January, 1832, though it was not till 1839 that the Dutch King finally accepted the terms of the London Conference.

The Effect of the Revolutionary Movements on England. — From France and Belgium the revolutionary movement spread to various German States, to Switzerland, Italy, and Poland. The Continental uprisings played an important part in precipitating the demand for reform in England. The restraint which had governed the July revolution in Paris was of particular significance in demonstrating to the conservative middle classes that results could be accomplished without anarchy and destructive excesses. Accordingly, they led an attack on the aristocratic régime, in which they gained a notable victory in a peaceful parliamentary way.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

Narrative. Brodrick and Fotheringham: Bright, III; Maxwell, *Century of Empire*, I; and *Cambridge Modern History*, X. J. A. R. Marriott, *England since Waterloo* (1913). Sir Spencer Walpole, *History of England*, 1815–1856 (6 vols., cab. ed., 1907), the most thorough history of the period; moderate Liberal standpoint. Harriet Martineau, *History of England during the Thirty Years' Peace, 1816-1846* (4 vols., ed. 1877) practically a contemporary work. G. Slater, *The Making of Modern England* (1915), an excellent survey; very liberal.

Parliament and Parliamentary Reform. See especially, May, *Constitutional History* (ed. 1907), I, and E. Porritt, *The Unreformed House of Commons* (2 vols., 1902, new ed. 1909).

Biographies and Special Works. For Wellington, Canning and Sidmouth, see ch. XLVII below. C. M. Atkinson, *Life of Jeremy Bentham* (1905). E. I. Carlyle, *Life of Wm. Cobbett* (1904). A. Bain, *Life of James Mill* (1882). G. Wallas, *Life of Francis Place* (1891). S. Walpole, *Life of Earl Russell* (2 vols., 1898). There are brief *Lives* of Peel by Lord Rosebery (1899), J. B. Thursfield (1891), Justin McCarthy (1892), F. C. Montague (1888) and G. Barnett Smith (1881). The fullest work on Peel is *Sir Robert Peel, His Life from His Private Correspondence* (3 vols., 1891–99, ed. C. S. Parker).

Political Parties. W. Harris, *History of the Radical Party in Parliament* (1885). C. B. R. Kent, *The English Radicals* (1899). T. E. Kebbel, *History of Toryism* (1886). J. A. Roebuck, *History of the Whig Party* (2 vols., 1852). W. L. Blease, *A Short History of English Liberalism* (1913).

B. Ward, *The Dawn of the Catholic Revival, 1781–1803* (1909) and *The Eve of Catholic Emancipation, 1803–1829* (3 vols., 1912).

Contemporary. Brougham, *Memoirs of His Own Times* (1871), very biased. C. G. Greville, *Journal of the Reigns of George IV and William IV* (ed. Henry Reeve, 1888); owing to his high family connections and his position as clerk of the Privy Council, Greville had exceptional means of information.

Selections from the sources. Adams, and Stephens, nos. 260–261. Robertson, *Select Statutes*, pt. I, XLIV–XLVI; pt. II, XXV–XXVI.

CHAPTER XLIX

ENGLAND AT THE EVE OF THE REFORM BILL

General Features. — The period between the beginning of the Industrial Revolution and the First Reform Bill was marked by many evidences of progress. Manners and morals improved steadily. There was a growing humanitarian spirit, and in spite of the prevalence of *laissez-faire*, the legislative stagnation during the French War and the greater part of the ensuing decade was followed by measures for bettering the condition of the subject, though little enough to improve the lot of the lesser folk who suffered so acutely both from the War and from the revolution in agriculture and industry. In literature the romantic revolt reached a glorious climax.

Manufactures. — Some new methods in manufacturing were introduced; on the whole, however, this was an age of perfecting existing processes, of extending the factory system and organizing labor, rather than of new inventions in production. The increased cheapness of processes is striking, — for example, in 1815 it cost only eightpence to spin a pound of cotton of a much finer quality than had cost forty-two shillings in 1775, — while the amazing growth in production is evident from the fact that exports had increased from £8,197,788 in 1749 to £58,624,550 in 1815.

British Shipping. — The tonnage of shipping of Great Britain was 619,000 in 1780; with that of Ireland added, it had gone up to 2,201,000 in 1830. The growing dependence on world markets naturally increased the instability of trade, accentuated by the American and French wars, which increased the uncertainty and risk of business, caused violent fluctuations in prices, encouraged speculation and led to unsteadiness of employment. The Continental System had the particular effect of cutting off some sources of food supply and giving an artificial stimulus to English tillage. But Great Britain, thanks to her command of the sea, and to her improved processes in textile and iron manufacture, was able to increase enormously her carrying trade, and to extend her markets. Napoleon himself was compelled

very reluctantly to buy her goods; while, to encourage French and Italian agriculture and to drain his rival of gold, he even allowed the export of foodstuffs to British ports in 1811. The most serious difficulties arose from the strained relations with the United States during the years preceding and including the War of 1812, when, for a time, an important market for manufactured goods, as well as a source for food and raw cotton, was almost wholly cut off. As has been seen, the end of the French War did not bring the prosperity which had been anticipated. Continental nations were too exhausted to buy much, and it was some years before the peace markets grew to equal those which the artificial demands of the War had created.

Road Building. — This period marked an epoch in communication and transportation. Thomas Telford (1757–1834) did a notable work in road construction, in building canals and bridges, and in improving harbors, though much as Telford accomplished, the man with whom the modern road system is chiefly associated is John McAdam (1756–1836) whose process, adopted throughout the civilized world, is known to-day as "macadamizing." The new roads supplemented the canals in facilitating transportation and gave a great impetus to traveling. The old cumbersome vehicles drawn by strong slow horses were replaced by a lighter type, and an average speed often to twelve miles an hour was attained. Remote, isolated towns awoke from their torpor and rubbed off their provincialism. Country gentlemen, who had hitherto traveled on horseback, commenced to make use of the public coaches, and, by mingling with men in other walks of life, began to discard their prejudices and self-sufficiency. But the real revolution in travel and transportation was wrought by steam.

The Steamboat and the Railroad. — The idea of steam navigation was very old; but no practical results were obtained until after Watt's invention had proved workable. In 1807 Robert Fulton, provided with a Watt engine, successfully operated his *Clermont* on the Hudson. Henry Bell's *Comet* began to run on the Clyde in 1813, and very soon steamboat travel became general. The successful application of steam power to rail traction was due to George Stephenson (1781–1848), who began life as a herder of cows, turned collier, and rose to be engine wright at a colliery. His first locomotive, tried in 1814, ran at the rate of three miles an hour. Later he became engineer for the first steam railway — the Stockdale and Darlington — opened in 1825. When he was chosen to undertake the operation of a line from Manchester to Liverpool, he nearly wrecked the project by asserting that trains might be run at the rate of ten miles an hour. However, his *Rocket*, in competition for a prize which he won, attained a speed

of thirty-five. The opening of the road, in 1830, marked the beginning of a new era, not only in transportation, but in opportunities for indefinitely increasing the employment of labor and capital.

Agriculture. —The revolution in agriculture, although it owed much to the factory system, was still further stimulated by the French wars. During the reign of George III between five and six millions of acres were enclosed, and more than half the total fell within the years between 1800 and 1820. Special Acts and agreements between parties were found too slow and cumbersome, so, beginning in 1801, a series of general Acts were passed to facilitate the work. While his predecessors had pointed the way, Arthur Young (1741–1820) did more than any other single man to complete the transformation of agricultural methods. In 1767 he began to make tours through Great Britain and France, and has left invaluable information in his graphic reports. Until 1810 he was constantly active, urging consolidation of holdings, reclamation of waste, granting long leases to large tenants and the investment of capital in land. He spread the results of the latest experiments in tillage and stock breeding, advocated the use of machinery for mowing, reaping and threshing, and fostered farmers' clubs and agricultural fairs. Aside from the extinction of the small cultivator, the only evil result of the new development was the fact that the war prices encouraged many to sink money in unproductive lands which could only be farmed at a loss when prices fell to their normal level.

Scientific Progress. — The modern era in science was heralded by the researches and discoveries of this period. Much of the notable work was done by Continental scholars; but Englishmen contributed their fair share. Henry Cavendish succeeded in converting hydrogen and oxygen into water and proved that it was a compound made up of these two gases. John Dalton was the first to show that chemical elements are composed of atoms or ultimate particles each of definite weight. This atomic theory placed the science on a new basis. Sir Humphrey Davy, in addition to contributions on the mechanical theory of heat and important electrochemical researches, conferred a priceless boon by his invention of the safety lamp (1815–1816) for miners; by covering the flame with gauze one of the most dangerous causes of explosions was practically eliminated. When Sir Charles Lyell (1797–1875), in his *Principles of Geology*, showed that " the great geological changes of the past are not to be explained by catastrophes, followed by successive creations, but as the product of the continuous play of forces still at work," a long step was taken toward the evolutionary theory which was soon to be established by Darwin. Edward

Jenner made the momentous discovery, first published in 1798, that occasional vaccination with the virus of cow-pox rendered human beings practically immune from small-pox, and, in cases where it was contracted, greatly mitigated the disease, though not till 1853 did England take the step, already adopted by many Continental countries, of making vaccination compulsory.

Philosophical and Economic Thinking. — While there was a vigorous reaction against the doctrine that external objects have no existence except in man's ideas of them, in general the period was more notable for its political and economic than for its purely philosophical thinking. The teachings of three men stand out preëminently. Adam Smith's free trade principles began to gain increasing currency. Jeremy Bentham (1748–1832) was a pioneer in the aim to secure the greatest happiness of the greatest number by scientific legislation. Thomas Malthus, in his *Essay on Population*, 1798, argued that a chief source of misery was the natural tendency of population to increase more rapidly than means of subsistence, and advocated checking its growth. Yet at the same time, he admitted that disease and poverty operated to partially modify his law, nor was he a simply hard-hearted theorist; for he enthusiastically supported the improvement of the lot of children by factory legislation.

Heralds of Romantic Revolt in Poetry. — The decline in poetry during the second part of the eighteenth century has been attributed to the influence of Pope. A more important factor, however, was the essentially prosaic character of the age. Yet, as has been seen, there were evidences of tendencies to break away from convention, to search back into the romance and mystery of the past, to sound the depths of fundamental human problems and to appreciate the beauties of external nature. William Cowper (1731–1800) unconsciously revealed a new attitude in his charming descriptions of rural life, notably in *The Task*. He was a gentle soul in whom occasional fits of gayety were darkened by long periods of religious melancholia. *John Gilpin's Ride*, 1783, was a product of one of his rollicking moods. Robert Burns (1759–1796), a Scotch farmer boy, was a unique apparition in lyric poetry. During a stormy life, brought to a premature close by his own weakness and folly, he produced a body of verse, ranging from pathos to mirth, which touches the deepest springs of human experience and which has the spontaneous melody of the songbird.

The Romantic Revolt. The "Lake School." — The really epoch-making event in the romantic reaction was the publication, in 1798, of the *Lyrical Ballads*, a little volume which was the joint work of William Wordsworth (1770–1850) and Samuel Taylor Coleridge (1772–

1834). The collaboration was due to warm personal friendship and a common revulsion against the existing literary traditions. Yet the two were strikingly unlike, both as poets and men. Coleridge's mind was prone to soar away into the regions of the supernatural, of dreamland and mystery, though he never went to the lengths of inartistic unreality, and he clothed his weird fancies in exquisitely melodious verse. His finest achievements, the *Ancient Mariner* — contributed to the *Lyrical Ballads* — *Kubla Khan*, and *Christabel* were all written as early as 1801, though *Christabel* was not published till 1816. In his later life he shone chiefly as a talker, as a critic, and as an interpreter of German transcendentalist philosophy. Owing to a growing infirmity of will, of which addiction to opium was at once a symptom and a cause, his projects, after his early manhood, were greater than his achievements. As to Wordsworth, no poet has shown a greater love of nature, a more sensitive appreciation of her varied aspects and of her subtle influence on those who reverently contemplate her. Nor has any other nature poet reproduced with more fidelity what he has seen and felt. Yet, lacking in humor and desirous to avoid artificial pomp, he sometimes sank to dull and almost ludicrous commonplace. *The Excursion*, his longest, but not his best poem, shows him at his best and worst, for it contains long arid stretches relieved by oases of lofty beauty. Coleridge and Wordsworth are the leading representatives of the so-called "Lake School," a term, however, which is very misleading; since it meant no more than a group of writers of widely different traits who were drawn by the ties of friendship to take up their residence in the Cumberland Lake district.

Scott and Byron. — Sir Walter Scott (1771–1832), by his antiquarain researches into the history and legends of Scotland, as well as by his astonishing productivity in romantic prose and poetry, did more than any other single man to foster the reviving interest in the past. In 1802–1803 appeared three volumes of *Border Minstrelsy*, a collection of Scotch ballads. Then came his splendid series of poems — the *Lay of the Last Minstrel*, *Marmion*, *The Lady of the Lake* — between 1805 and 1815. Owing to the sudden vogue of a new figure in the poetic world — Lord Byron (1788–1824) — he turned to prose. Byron was destined to prove a tempestuous spirit in life and literature. Scott was a Tory by temperament and tradition, while Coleridge and Wordsworth, though they began as enthusiasts for the French Revolution, were driven into the conservative ranks by the excesses which followed. Byron, on the other hand, was a persistent revolutionist against existing institutions and met his death as a volunteer in the war for Greek Independence. He first manifested his fiery temper in *English Bards*

and Scotch Reviewers, 1809, a reply to a scathing criticism of his early poems. After a journey to Greece and the Orient he published the first two cantos of *Childe Harold* in 1812. Most of his verse in this period was struck off at a white heat, brilliant, but careless, stagey and lacking in depth of feeling and sureness of imaginative range. His best poetry came a little later — the remaining cantos of *Childe Harold*, and *Don Juan*, to mention only the long works. *Don Juan* was a sardonic satire on the immorality and cant prevailing in the society of the day. Byron was a militant egotist, and taught the dangerous message of individual lawlessness; but his personal beauty and his lameness which gave it a touch of pathos, his picturesque temperament, his wild irregular career and tragic end, all contributed, together with his splendid power of rhetoric and the intensity of his passions, to gain for him a popularity which was followed by an equally strong reaction. This, in its turn, has been succeeded by a more discriminating appreciation of his enduring poetic qualities.

Shelley and Keats. — There are many points of resemblance between Byron and Percy Bysshe Shelley (1792–1822). Both were poets of revolt against the religious, social and political institutions of their time, and both led short and stormy lives. Shelley was drowned off the coast of Italy in the thirtieth year of his age. His earliest long poem, *Queen Mab*, appeared privately in 1813, a crude harbinger of what was to come, — *Alastor;* the *Revolt of Islam;* the *Cenci; Prometheus Unbound*. These, together with numerous shorter poems and a considerable body of prose, including translations, were all produced within ten years. Shelley was a generous and impulsive visionary who had a real philosophy of revolution, and who wrote with spiritual fervor and matchless melody. No poet ever surpassed him in his finest lyrical flights; but the beauties of his thought and expression are unearthly, ethereal in character. John Keats (1795–1821) was a frankly human poet with a love of the beauty of the earth and its people, and, unlike either Byron or Shelley, he bore no message of revolt to mankind. Though dependent upon translations, in the case of Greek, he saturated himself with the legends of antiquity, and, with the further aid of Spenser and some of the seventeenth-century poets, he reproduced the spirit of the classic times with wonderful imaginative power. His first volume of verses was published in 1817, *Endymion* followed in 1818, and, in 1820, came a collection of poems which marks the supreme fruition of his genius. Keats had to struggle against early disadvantages, and he succumbed to consumption at the age of twenty-five; but, in his brief interval of activity, he prepared a heritage which has permanently enriched the English speech.

Novelists. — Novel writing showed a marked development as the century advanced. Beginning with realistic pictures of English life, chiefly on the external side, the scope of prose fiction gradually widened and deepened, as historical study and travel increased the knowledge of past times and other lands, and as men began to study more closely into the psychology of human conduct. William Godwin, a free-thinker and pioneer among political radicals, published *Caleb Williams* in 1794, a protest against the injustice of the aristocracy toward the poor. Maria Edgeworth (1767–1849), an Irishwoman, wrote a series of novels, of which *Castle Rackrent*, 1800, is the best, chiefly to depict the wrongs which her country[1] had to suffer from absentee landlords and other evils, and furnish valuable pictures of contemporary Irish life. According to Scott's own modest testimony, her achievements in this particular suggested to him the plan of his famous *Waverley Novels* which tell us so much about the seventeenth and eighteenth century Scotland. The success they attained encouraged him to write his equally famous works relating to the Middle Ages. While his facts were not always strictly accurate and while his pictures of medieval life do not always correspond to actual historical conditions, his work is, nevertheless, remarkable for its high and varied excellence. Jane Austen (1775–1817) had no moral lessons to expound, and she made no effort to deal with life outside the provincial society of southern England; but she describes the folk in her own restricted circle with such penetrating observation, rare humor and artistic fidelity as to gain for her a place in the first rank of English artists. *Pride and Prejudice* is her best known, and, all told, her finest book.

The Essayists. — This period was famous for its essayists, among whom De Quincey and Lamb stand the foremost, with Hazlitt and Leigh Hunt not far behind. Thomas De Quincey (1785–1859) is perhaps best known for his *Confessions of an English Opium Eater*. His distinction as a stylist rests upon his "impassioned prose" — an attempt to revive the long rhythmical sentences and gorgeous imagery of the pre-Restoration period. Charles Lamb (1775–1834), who, jointly with his sister Mary, did the *Tales from Shakespeare*, produced his best work in the *Essays of Elia*, where he showed an inimitable art of transforming with literary grace the commonest incidents of London life and weaving about them the spell of romance. Leigh Hunt (1784–1859) produced charming pieces of critical and miscellaneous prose and excellent verses as well. His *Abou Ben Adhem* is a popular classic. William Hazlitt (1778–1830) has been described as "the

[1] Thomas Moore's *Irish Melodies* voice beautifully in verse the spirit of his native land.

most accomplished dramatic critic England has produced." His best essays owe their engaging quality to the personal touches he has introduced.

Periodical Literature. — One of the most notable features of the early nineteenth century was the appearance of two periodicals which contributed much to organize criticism as a distinct branch of English letters, assumed the position of literary dictators, and became potent influences in politics as well. The *Edinburgh Review* was projected, in 1802, by Francis Jeffrey, Brougham and Sidney Smith. Under the able editorship of Jeffrey it dominated the field until 1809, when Scott, an occasional contributor, becoming alienated by its Whig bias, joined Canning in founding the *Quarterly Review*, which, although it attracted many gifted writers, never attained quite the brilliancy of its older rival. The growing importance of periodicals and the rise of women authors, which began with Fanny Burney, are among the most distinctive facts of modern English letters.[1]

Painting. — While portrait painters of reputation flourished during this period, none of them rank with their three famous predecessors, and the significant feature in the history of painting is the slow but steady development of the landscape art to the triumphant achievements of Turner and Constable. Worthy of mention as they are, the intervening names must be passed by. Joseph Mallord William Turner (1775–1851) was the son of a London hairdresser, but nevertheless had a long and thorough training in his art. Up to 1820 he was mainly occupied in imitating the old masters. Then he struck out for himself, and, for about fifteen years, his chief aim was to produce ideal, poetic creations rather than actual reproductions from nature. The choicest fruit of this period was *Ulysses Deriding Polyphemus* (1829), generally regarded as his masterpiece. In the third phase of his artistic career he devoted himself to depicting what he actually saw, though, even then, his gorgeous colorings, particularly his glowing sunsets, mark him as a romantic poet with the brush. This is evident in his famous *Fighting Téméraire* (1839). John Constable (1776–1837) was the great master of English landscape painting, of the prose as distinguished from the poetic type. It was he who completed the emancipation from all convention, and founded a school with the guiding aim of reproducing natural scenery with the utmost fidelity. While his own countrymen were slow in appreciating

[1] The *Times*, the greatest newspaper in the world, took its rise about the time that the daily press was beginning really to count as a factor in politics. It was founded by John Walter in 1785; but did not assume its present name till three years later.

his art, the French welcomed it with promptness and enthusiasm, and he exercised a potent influence on Corot, Millet and the other members of the famous coterie of Barbizon.

Social Effects of the French Revolution. — The social effects of the French Revolution were as striking as the political. Cut off from making the Grand Tour by reasons of safety and economy alike, people of fashion confined their holiday to trips to English watering places. Also Fox and his set, who had hitherto set the fashion in dandified dress, began to affect republican simplicity. Poverty as well as caprice induced many to follow his example, even to the extent of appearing in Parliament in greatcoats and top-boots, instead of the customary Court dress and sword. Various causes contributed to transform radically the prevailing style of costume. Improved processes of woolen and cotton manufacture resulted in a steadily decreasing use of silks, satins and velvets by both sexes. In consequence of the tax on powder, women ceased to powder their hair. Wigs, except in the case of judges, professional men and clergy, had been generally discarded early in the reign of George III, and now those of the extremer sort began to wear their hair short. In the last decade of the century, buckled knee breeches began to give way to pantaloons and Hessian boots, sparrow-tail coats became the fashion, and the cocked hat yielded to the top or "sugar-loaf" hat. These innovations, however, were taken up at first only by the upper classes. The ordinary citizen and the countryman still clung to knee breeches and wide-skirted coats.

The French Revolution was also not without effect on morals. Social dissipation and extravagance gave place to greater simplicity and earnestness. One evidence was a strong reaction against excessive gambling. In 1796, the Chief Justice threatened certain ladies of rank with the pillory for keeping faro banks in their houses, and, during the next year, three were actually fined. More important than repression was the fact that stress of events offered food for conversation, and opened avenues of activity in military and political life more engrossing than idle frivolity. New societies were founded for the reformation of manners and the better observance of the Sabbath, while the philanthropic spirit aroused by the evangelical revival was stimulated by the misery engendered by the War and the introduction of machinery. Heavy drinking was a still prevalent vice. Men were not ashamed to appear drunk, even in Parliament, and, unhappily, had a sorry example in the otherwise austere Pitt. However, except in the case of the Prince of Wales and his boon companions, a marked improvement was noticeable among the political leaders during the

first two decades of the nineteenth century. Dueling was common, and generally approved by society throughout this period. Owing, however, to increasing protests, earnest efforts were later made to stamp out the practice. In 1830 two judges declared the survivor in a duel guilty of murder, in 1844 the amended Articles of War provided that officers should give and accept apologies and should be cashiered if they fought, and, in 1845, a Radical member brought a challenge before the House as a breach of privilege. These measures, backed by a gradual change in public opinion, proved effective.

The Game Laws. — While the country gentry were increasing their rent rolls, the merchants and manufacturers were steadily encroaching upon their old social and political exclusiveness. The change in the game laws was one indication of the breaking down of the old aristocratic privileges. Since the seventeenth century no man had been allowed to kill game, even on his own land, unless he possessed a freehold estate worth £100 a year, or a £150 leasehold. The sale of game was altogether prohibited. The laws were evaded in ingenious ways. Landowners provided shooting for their younger sons or brothers by making them gamekeepers, while, in spite of heavy penalties, poaching and selling game were very common. The injustice of the existing system was somewhat mitigated by a bill, in 1832, providing that the killing and selling of game be allowed to anyone obtaining a license from the inland revenue department.

Laws Against Cruelty to Animals. — An increasing humanitarian spirit was seen in measures against cruelty to animals. Richard Martin (1754–1834), a wealthy Irish landowner, was a pioneer in this work, which earned him the name of "Humanity Martin." In 1823 he carried a bill to prevent the ill-treatment of horses and cattle; but he was not even allowed to introduce a measure to prohibit bull-baiting and dog-fighting, on the ground that it would interfere with the sports of the poor. Undaunted by this setback he founded, in 1824, the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, and the fruit of his efforts was a law, passed ten years later, which did away with bull-baiting, ox-driving, and cock-fighting.

The Reform of the Criminal Law. — This period marks the first steps in the reform of the barbarous and unreasonable criminal code, which, at the beginning of the century, included nearly two hundred offenses involving capital punishment. For instance, picking a pocket to the value of twelvepence, robbing a shop to the amount of five shillings or a house to the amount of forty, were punishable by death. What with misery, excessive drinking and an ineffective police system, crime increased with startling rapidity. But signs

of improvement were already evident. In 1815 the pillory was done away with for every offense except perjury, and twenty years later it was abolished for that offense as well. The flogging of women was declared illegal in 1817. Brougham did much to simplify procedure, while Peel, who prepared the way for a better enforcement of the laws by the establishment of the metropolitan police system in 1829, greatly improved the criminal code, and, before he left office, he had reduced the capital penalties to about a score, including murder, arson, highway robbery, house-breaking, cattle-stealing, counterfeiting, and forgery. While he deserves much credit, his work would have been impossible but for a change in public opinion to which the persistent efforts of Sir Samuel Romilly largely contributed.[1] All together, while the great epoch of reform came after 1832, not a little was done in the previous decade to break down old exclusive privileges, and to legislate with a view to promoting the greatest happiness of the greatest number.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

General Conditions. Traill, *Social England*, VI. S. Walpole, *History of England*, I, chs. I–III. Brodrick and Fotheringham, ch. XX.

Social and Industrial. J. Ashton, *Social Life under the Regency* (1890). *Cambridge Modern History*, X, ch. XXIII (bibliography 883–889). Cunningham, *English Industry and Commerce*. Porter, *Progress of the Nation*. Rogers, *Six Centuries of Work and Wages* and *Agriculture and Prices*. Wm. Cobbett, *Rural Rides* (new ed., 1886) and *Tour in the Northern Counties* (1833). R. M. Garnier, *History of the English Landed Gentry* (1893) and *Annals of the British Peasantry* (1895). Hammond, *The Town Labourer* and *The Village Labourer*. Prothero, *English Farming*. Webb, *Trades Unionism*. Usher, *Industrial History*. H. R. Hodge, *Economic Conditions, 1815–1914* (1917).

Literature and Scholarship. *Cambridge Modern History*, X, chs. XXII–XXIV (bibliographies 879–882, 890–892). Moody and Lovett. Taine, III. Saintsbury, *Nineteenth Century Literature* (1896). O. Elton, *A Survey of English Literature, 1780–1830* (2 vols., 1913). G. M. C. Brandes, *Main*

[1] By successive Acts, passed at intervals during the next generation, capital penalties were steadily reduced, and, since 1861, the only offenses punishable by death are four, *i.e.* treason, murder, piracy with violence, and setting fire to arsenals and dock-yards. It is commonly said that the excessive death penalties furnished the most fruitful encouragement to crime, since juries shrank from convicting. As a matter of fact, the percentage of convictions was fairly high, though the utmost rigor of the law, in the case of first offenders, was usually evaded by a merciful disregard of the facts. For example, when a culprit had robbed a house of clearly more than 40*s.* he was found guilty of stealing 39*s.* 10*d.*, and not let off, but sentenced to some lighter punishment, such as transportation.

Currents in Nineteenth Century Literature (Eng. tr. V, 1905). L. Stephen, *Hours in a Library* (3 vols., 1892). H. A. Beers, *English Romanticism in the Nineteenth Century* (1899). E. Dowden, *The French Revolution and English Literature* (1897). W. J. Courthope, *A History of English Poetry*, (1905). W. V. Raleigh, *The English Novel* (1894). W. L. Davidson, *Political Thought in England: the Utilitarians from Bentham to J. S. Mill* (1915).

CHAPTER L

THE EPOCH OF REFORM. WILLIAM IV (1830–1837)

William IV. — William, Duke of Clarence, the third son of George III, had nearly completed his sixty-fifth year when he came to the throne. While naturally kind-hearted, he was full of prejudices, liable to sudden fits of passion, and prone to make long rambling and absurd speeches on the most inappropriate occasions. At his accession, however, these peculiarities were not generally known, and he proved so good-natured, frank and simple that he was received with popular enthusiasm almost unheard of. In spite of his shortcomings and follies he had right instincts, and a rough common sense, which proved a great help to his Ministers in the first great crisis of his reign.

The Causes of the Reform Movement. — Catholic Emancipation had been carried in Parliament against the popular will, while parliamentary reform, which was now coming to be the burning issue, owed its passage to the demands of a majority of the English people. The revolution in public opinion which had recently begun to manifest itself was due to a combination of four causes. The first was the transference of the balance of wealth from the landed aristocracy to the great merchants and manufacturers. The second was the shifting of the centers of population from the south and east to the midlands and the north, which made the unequal distribution of representation between the two sections a crying grievance. The third was the fact that the horrors of the French Revolution and the Napoleonic aggression, and, indeed, of the domestic unrest which followed the Great War, were fading from the memory of Englishmen, while the recent course of events in Paris was such as to stimulate rather than to retard their ardor. The fourth, and perhaps the most significant cause of all, was the influence of the advanced thinkers and the zeal of the practical statesmen who labored to prepare the way during the long and discouraging years of reaction.

Jeremy Bentham and His Influence. — Foremost in influence was the pioneer of the Utilitarians, Jeremy Bentham (1748–1832), of whom it is perhaps not too much to say " progressive and practical reformers

throughout the world owe more . . . than to any other single man." When he was twenty years of age he adopted as his maxim "the greatest happiness of the greatest number," and the means which he adopted for realizing his end was scientific legislation. Beginning as an advocate of moderate and gradual reform, the refusal of the statesmen in power to listen to him was responsible for turning him into a radical, though his conversion was somewhat delayed by his fear of the French Revolution. His *Catechism of Parliamentary Reform*, in which he outlined his political views, was written in 1809, but was not published till 1817. Assuming that the aim of all government is utility — the good of the governed — he argued that the existing system was hopelessly at fault, since it was the instrument of the aristocratic minority for the promotion of class interests. Curiously enough, he had a low opinion of mankind, believing that the governing motive of the individual was the furtherance of his own ends. For that very reason, however, he advocated the extension of popular government, on the ground that the control of the majority would make for the good of the greatest number. He failed to realize that, even if all men were selfish, their individual interests were bound to conflict, and that the sum total would not be harmony, but discord; nevertheless, his arguments for increased parliamentary representation had great force and wide-reaching effect. Owing, however, to the diffuseness and obscurity of his style, his views were spread more through his disciples than by his own writings. Philosophical radicals, popular agitators, and practical statesmen all contributed to carry his teachings into effect.

Movement for Parliamentary Reform. — While parliamentary reform did not become an issue in practical politics till the beginning of the reign of William IV, the subject had been discussed at intervals for nearly a century. Best known among its early and unsuccessful advocates were Chatham, Wilkes, and Pitt. In 1792, the Society of the Friends of the People was formed for promoting the movement; but sober folk very generally coupled it with Revolutionary designs. The cause was still further prejudiced when the Radicals took it up and proceeded to demand also universal suffrage, annual parliaments, equal electoral districts and vote by ballot. In 1819, however, Lord John Russell, by introducing a motion for moderate reform, once more identified the question with the Whig party. Though he gained an increasing body of supporters, he fought an uphill fight for thirteen years.

The Eve of Triumph. Whig Gains in the Election of 1830. — For a time even the liberal remnant of the Canningites persisted in re-

garding the existing parliamentary system as the only breakwater against the rising tide of democracy, but the temperate attitude of the Whig leaders had won the confidence of the conservative middle classes. They contended that, while universal suffrage was wild and dangerous, the enfranchisement of householders and the transfer of votes from small decayed boroughs to populous towns was not only safe and reasonable but an imperative recognition of the growing importance of the commercial and industrial classes. Parliament was dissolved during the summer of 1830, and in the general election which followed, the Whigs made such decisive gains that the doom of the old Tory party was sounded.

Advent of Grey's Reform Ministry (November, 1830).—Nevertheless, the King's speech at the opening of Parliament contained no reference on the subject of reform. The disappointment of the reformers was turned to fury when Wellington, in the Lords, declared that the existing representative system "possessed the full and entire confidence of the country." Insisting further that "no better system could be devised by the wit of man," he announced that not only would he never introduce a Reform Bill himself, but that "he should always feel it his duty to resist such measures when proposed by others." The effect of the speech was to overthrow his Government. Apparently the Duke spoke on his own authority; but the Cabinet stood by him and resigned in November, on an adverse vote on the Civil List, without waiting to face the inevitable question. Thereupon, Earl Grey (1764–1845) consented to form a Ministry, on condition that parliamentary reform should be made a Cabinet question. He had grown old in the service of the Whig party during the period of its adversity. Fear of radicalism had caused him for a time to hold aloof from reform, of which he had been an early pioneer; but he had again taken up the work, and it was fitting that the surviving Nestor of the cause should be chosen Premier on the return of the Whigs to office. The Ministers whom he selected were almost exclusively peers or men of titled connections; however, it was a remarkable group, four of whom subsequently became Prime Ministers. The task confronting the new Ministry was a tremendous and complicated one.

The Unreformed House of Commons. Inequalities of Representation.—The existing representative system was both inadequate and corrupt. The franchise was restricted to a few, and was unequally distributed. The area embraced by the ten southern counties of England had almost the same number of representatives as that of the thirty midland and northern counties where there were nearly three times as many inhabitants. Lancashire and Cornwall offered

the most glaring contrast; the former had 1,000,000 inhabitants and 19 members, while the latter with about a quarter of this population had 44. It is easy to explain how these inequalities arose. The evil was manifest chiefly in the cities and boroughs. Originally such had been selected as would be most likely to vote supplies to the Crown. The burgesses and citizens, who looked upon representation as a burden so long as they had little share in legislation, usually, in the Middle Ages, sought to evade their obligations. In consequence, the Sovereigns and sheriffs were accustomed to add to the list or omit from it at will. Gradually, however, it came to be recognized that a town which had once sent members was entitled to do so ever after. Then, in the reign of Charles II, it was decided that no new boroughs could be created.

The Abuses of the Existing Borough System. — While these latter provisions were some protection against despotic Sovereigns, they were responsible for the fact that small decayed places continued to send representatives, while new and flourishing centers of industry got none. Old Sarum, for instance, was no longer anything but a green mound, while Dunwich was gradually being covered by the North Sea, so that it was suggested that the voters would soon have to go out in boats to exercise their electoral privileges. Malmesbury contained thirteen electors none of whom could write. Such deserted or half-deserted constituencies fell an easy prey to territorial magnates, to the agents of the Crown, or to rich speculators who gained control in one way or another, sometimes by buying the borough outright, sometimes by bribing the scanty body of electors. As a result, it is probably safe to say that, by 1830, not more than a third of the House was freely chosen and then only by a very limited body of electors.

Types of Boroughs. Qualifications for Voting. — There were four types of boroughs. (1) There were nomination or pocket boroughs where the patron or proprietor had the absolute right of returning the candidates. (2) Next there were the rotten boroughs where the electors were controlled by bribery and influence. (3) In still another type of borough the body of electors was numerous but restricted. (4) Finally there were a very few where the right of voting rested on a democratic basis. The qualifications for voting in boroughs were varied and curious. They, again, may be divided into four main groups. The first were based on tenure. In a few towns which had been made counties by charter, the county qualification of ownership of a forty-shilling freehold prevailed. More common was the burgage holding, an ancient form of freehold tenement, very limited in number, in towns. Secondly, there were a number of residence qualifications. In some cases the "inhabitant householders" could vote. In others,

it was those liable to scot and lot — certain old local taxes, together with local duties such as serving in municipal offices. In still other cases those who had a single room where they could cook their own food could vote. This class was known as potwallers or potwallopers — corruptions of the original term potboiler. In the third class of boroughs the franchise was confined to the freemen of the municipal corporation. This right could be acquired by inheritance from the original freemen, by marriage to the heiress of a freeman, by admission to a trading company or gild, or by purchase. Finally, there were the close boroughs where the right to vote was confined to the governing body of the municipality — the mayor, aldermen, and councilors. Most of the charters of the Tudors and Stuarts limited the electorate in this fashion. Even in boroughs where a democratic qualification existed, the number of electors was usually so small that they could be easily bribed.

Bribery and Corruption in Elections. — Bribery first began to be systematic under Charles II, and increased with the growing influence of the House of Commons. It reached its height in the reign of George III, when two causes especially fostered its growth. One was the firm determination of the King to reëstablish the waning royal ascendancy. The other was the appearance of a class of men, known as nabobs, who having made fortunes in the East and West Indies, spent their money lavishly to secure parliamentary seats; their competition and that of the steadily increasing class of opulent merchants and manufacturers in England sent the prices soaring.[1] Bribery was an offense at Common Law; an occasional Act was passed to remedy the evil, and a few of the more corrupt cases were exposed; but it was all to little purpose, particularly so long as George III actively promoted the system. Moreover, the penalties were light: disfranchisement of the guilty or the merging of the constituency into one slightly larger. Not only were individual electors bribed, but nomination and rotten boroughs were sold outright; indeed, seats were advertised openly and shamelessly. In 1809 an Act imposing the penalties of fine and forfeiture of seat achieved little more at first than to make the practice less open.

The County Franchise. — In the counties, although conditions were better, the system was not free from anomalies and abuses. The forty-shilling freehold qualification, created in 1430, insured a fairly wide constituency. On the other hand, copyholders and men who rented broad lands on lease were excluded, while, owing to the immense

[1] The average price for a borough went up from £2500 to £5000. One sold for £9000.

change in money values, forty shillings had shrunk to a very small sum. Many freeholders were merely poor dependents of their great neighbors, and, thanks to the custom of open polling, they were peculiarly subject to corruption and intimidation. The evils were accentuated in county and borough alike, by the long period allowed for voting and the drunkenness and turmoil which prevailed during the elections. These county elections were often the arena where the political rivalry of the landed magnates, many of whom wielded tremendous influence, was displayed.[1] Each county was represented by two members, which meant an even distribution throughout the country; but it put tiny shires like Rutland on the same basis as large and populous ones like Lancashire.

Scotland and Ireland. — In Scotland conditions were even worse than in England. In a population of over 2,000,000 there were not more than 4000 voters. The borough franchise was vested in town councilors, while the right to vote in the counties was a peculiar privilege that depended neither upon property nor residence. Argyleshire, with 100,000 inhabitants, had 115 electors, of whom only 31 owned any land in the county. Naturally votes were put up for sale; moreover, the great landowners who secured control, instead of fighting on party lines, commonly agreed to support the Government in return for patronage and other rewards. In Ireland the system of borough franchise was bad enough; but that in the counties was, until 1829, worse. By Irish law, forty-shilling freeholders could be created without grant of property. The landed potentates availed themselves eagerly of the opportunity — especially after the Union — until Daniel O'Connell and the priests managed to tear from their control these lesser folk whom they had regarded as their creatures.

Bribery and Corruption in Parliament. — A natural result of the faulty and corrupt electoral system was the venality and self-seeking of those who secured seats, since most of the members or their patrons expected to be compensated for their outlays to electors or boroughmongers. Inducements were offered to suit all tastes. The rich and ambitious were tempted with peerages, titles of honor, patronage and favor; the poor and mercenary by places, pensions, and bribes. The Act of 1705 had done something to diminish the number of placemen, and, though the incapacity was later extended to pensioners, grants were continued in secret. The Rockingham Act of 1782 put an effective check on secret pensions; moreover, by virtue of this and

[1] Yet the voters when aroused could act with independence, as is proved from the fact that, in 1830, out of 82 county members only 20 Tories were returned.

other Acts, the number of placemen in the Commons was further reduced during the period from George I to George IV. Meantime, however, the practice of directly bribing members grew steadily from the Restoration to the American Revolution. Though Pitt discontinued the practice, he created more peers than any Minister before or since. Another and more wasteful means employed by George III to secure supporters in the years of his personal supremacy was through loans and lotteries, in which the King's friends were accorded the preference in the distribution of shares and tickets. Pitt was also responsible for removing this type of abuse.[1]

Counteracting Tendencies. — Nevertheless, England progressed in many directions and achieved much in the eighteenth century, while her people were freer and her institutions far better than those of any other European country. Many reasons explain why this was so. In the first place, politics attracted the ablest and some of the best men of the age, who, while they advanced their own interests, labored to make their country the leading Power in the world. At crises, too, they deferred to public opinion, an opinion in which the sound traditions of the previous century survived, and which was being fed by the new and enlightened ideas of the growing commercial and industrial classes. Moreover, after the Tories again became a factor in politics at the accession of George III, party rivalry played an important rôle in checking the evils which had developed during the Whig ascendancy. The Whigs soon fell into eclipse for a time; but their leaders were active and courageous in denouncing the shortcomings of their political rivals. The press, too, became more and more a means of ventilating abuses and corruption. While many evils had been checked or done away with when the Grey Ministry came to power, the cumbersome, inadequate method of representation which did so much to foster them still remained. Partly for that reason and partly because of the exclusion of many persons and many communities who demanded a voice in public affairs, reform was necessary and inevitable.

The First Reform Bill and Its Defeat (19 April, 1831). — The two general objects in the work which the Grey Ministry now undertook were to redistribute parliamentary seats on a more equal basis, and to extend the right of voting. Lord John Russell, who had labored so persistently in the cause, was chosen to introduce the measure and to explain its terms. Outside Parliament, the people showed intense enthusiasm in public meetings, in political unions, and in floods of

[1] The Rockingham Act had already excluded contractors from the House of Commons in 1782.

petitions. Also, the borough interests, who had so much at stake, roused themselves and were backed by two thirds of the Peers, by a strong minority in the Commons, and by the Tory sentiment throughout the country. The second reading[1] was carried by a majority of one, amidst scenes of wildest joy on the part of the Whigs, yet the Bill was defeated in the committee stage, 19 April, 1831, by an amendment against a provision for reducing the membership of the Commons.

Its Second Defeat and Its Final Passage (1832). — The Government thereupon persuaded King William to appeal to the people in another general election, one of the most momentous in English history. The cry throughout the country was: "The Bill, the whole Bill, and nothing but the Bill." The reformers triumphed, and the second Bill passed the new House of Commons, 21 September, by a majority of 109; nevertheless, the Lords proved stubborn and threw out the measure on the second reading. The leading newspapers appeared in mourning, and the *Times* declared that it turned from "the appalling sight of a wounded nation to the means already in action for recovery." Since the reverse was not unexpected, the Ministry, sustained by a vote of confidence in the Commons, merely prorogued Parliament and prepared the third Bill. Among other changes the clause reducing the membership was dropped. The agitation outside, which, even though intense, had hitherto been peaceful, now became violent. Riots broke out in London and other cities, the most serious of which occurred in Bristol, in the last days of October, when the mob reigned supreme for two days. The political unions, too, became so active and aggressive that a proclamation was issued suppressing certain of them by name. When Parliament met again, the Commons sent the new Bill to the Upper House with an increased majority. Fearful of continuing to defy public opinion openly, the Lords voted for the second reading, by a majority of nine, but in the committee stage they insisted upon amendments which the Ministry could not accept. Popular excitement became furious in its intensity, a clamor arose that the Peers be forced into line, and many political associations refused to pay taxes. With the country trembling on the verge of a revolution, Grey was persuaded by his colleagues to advise the King to create a sufficient number of new Peers to carry the Bill. Upon William's refusal the Cabinet resigned. Wellington undertook to form a Ministry; but finding the task as hopeless as it was dangerous, he counseled the King to recall Earl Grey. William even went

[1] A Bill before its passage has to be read three times in each House. The first reading is usually a mere formality. Between the second and third readings there is a careful consideration by a committee of the whole.

so far as to consent to the creation of new Peers, on condition that he might confine himself to the heirs of existing noblemen; but, by using his influence with the Tory Lords, he managed in the end to avoid this extreme step. A hundred Peers, led by Wellington, withdrew from the Upper House during the final voting. With the Tory opposition thus weakened, the Bill passed through the committee stage and the third reading, and received the royal assent, 7 July, 1832.

The Terms of the Reform Act of 1832. — The Act in its final form disfranchised fifty-six nomination and rotten boroughs, each of which had less than 2000 inhabitants and which together returned 111 members. Thirty boroughs where the population was less than 4000 were deprived of a single member each, while one double borough lost two of its four. There were thus 143 seats for redistribution. Twenty-two large towns received two, and twenty-one a single member each. Furthermore, the county membership was increased from 94 to 159. The remaining thirteen representatives were left for Scotland and Ireland. In addition to redistribution of seats, the Bill undertook a moderate extension and equalization of the franchise. In the boroughs the various, queer, and antiquated franchises were abolished, with one exception,[1] and the vote was given to all householders paying a rental of £10 a year. In the counties, the forty-shilling freehold qualification was retained in the case of the voter who occupied his estate, or who had acquired it by inheritance, marriage or other specified ways. In other cases, a £10 qualification was established for freeholders, copyholders and leaseholders for terms of sixty years. A qualification of £50 was fixed for leaseholders for shorter terms and for tenants-at-will.

Scotland and Ireland. — Scotland and Ireland were dealt with in two separate bills. The Scotch representatives were increased from 45 to 53, and, in the redistribution, 30 went to the counties and 23 to the cities and boroughs. In the former, all owners of property worth £10 a year and certain classes of leaseholders were given the right to vote, in the latter, the £10 householders, while, at the same time, the old qualifications were abolished. Ireland was given five more representatives.[2] At the time of the Union a number of nomination and rotten boroughs had been swept away. While the remainder were

[1] Resident freemen, created before March, 1831, were allowed to retain their vote. The qualification was designed to get rid of hosts of freemen who had been created to vote against the Reform Bill.

[2] Making a total of 105. Two seats were afterwards taken away because of corruption, leaving 103, the present number.

left undisturbed by the Act of 1832, the right to return members of Parliament was taken from the municipal corporations and conferred upon the £10 householders.[1]

The Results of the Reform Bill. — The Revolution of 1688 had transferred the chief power from the Sovereign to the landed aristocracy; the Reform Bill shifted the balance to the commercial and industrial middle class. Consequently the system of Cabinet and party government now became more of a reality; for the Ministers henceforth represented a popular majority in the House of Commons, and not one depending upon the manipulation of the Sovereign, the Ministers and the landowning magnates. The passage of the measure had demonstrated, too, that, at a crisis, the House of Lords could not defy the popular will. Furthermore, the triumph was an indication that the principle of change which had been struggling for expression during the past decade was going to prevail. On the other hand, the Reform Bill did not accomplish all that its advocates had predicted. It did not put an end, for instance, to bribery and corruption, though the widening of the electorate tended further to lessen these evils. Moreover, while it took a long step in the direction of equality of representation, it left the bulk of the working classes — the majority of the population — without the vote. Among this element there was widespread discontent, which, while it was to some extent stirred up by disappointed hopes, was due to real suffering.

The First Reformed Parliament and the Remedial Legislation of 1833. — While, on the whole, the class of members elected to the first reformed House of Commons was not strikingly different from that of the Parliaments immediately preceding, the Whigs and the other anti-Tory elements were in an overwhelming majority, though they were far from being united. The Tory minority was also divided, though not so markedly: there was a considerable group of moderate men led by Peel who had discarded the old party name and who adopted that of "Conservatives." Indeed, it was not long before the terms Whig and Tory were completely superseded by those of Liberal and Conservative respectively. The distinguishing feature of the new Parliament was its zeal for legislation. Among the long list of remedial measures were: the Irish Church Temporalities Bill; the abolition of slavery in the British Colonies; and an epoch-making Factory Act. The leading measures of the memorable session of 1833 deserve to be treated in detail.

The Irish Tithe War (1831–1833). — The achievements of the year are all the more remarkable in view of the attention demanded by

[1] In 1850 the borough qualification was reduced to £8.

the troubled situation in Ireland, where a great "tithe war" had broken out in 1831. In a population of nearly 8,000,000 souls, less than 900,000 belonged to the Established Episcopal Church, and some 600,000 were Presbyterians, while the remainder, more than 6,000,000, were Roman Catholics. Largely agriculturists, whose tiny holdings yielded barely enough to keep them from starvation, to say nothing of supporting their own priests, the latter resented the payment of tithes to the hated representatives of an alien faith. Moreover, the method of assessment and collection was irritating and unfair. Grassland was exempt, and the chief burden fell on the lesser folk who could ill spare their pigs and their poultry.[1] Yet, pitiable as was the situation of the Irish peasantry, the ferocity with which they tortured and murdered the tithe-proctors and abused and intimidated those who obeyed the law is the most deplorable. After the Government had safely carried the Reform Bill it attempted, though with no great success, to relieve the situation. Early in 1832 the Lord Lieutenant was authorized to advance money to the clergy who were suffering from failure to collect the chief source of their income. The Government officials then undertook, with the aid of the military, to collect the arrears; but their efforts proved as futile as they were expensive, so the attempt was given up, a much larger sum was advanced to the clergy, and a new project was set on foot, only carried out five years later — to substitute for the tithes a money land tax.

The Coercion Bill and the Irish Church Temporalities Bill (1833). — Meantime, the use of military force had only aggravated the passions of the Irish. Murders, assaults, and destruction of property increased with alarming rapidity. Secret organizations multiplied, while the courts were hampered by the intimidation of jurors and witnesses. To meet the situation, Stanley, the Irish Secretary, introduced two measures: a Church Temporalities Bill and a Peace Preservation Bill. The former imposed a graduated tax on clerical incomes to relieve the Irish ratepayers from the burden of parish expenses, and provided for the reduction of the Irish Episcopate by abolishing two of the four archbishoprics and eight of the eighteen bishoprics, as vacancies should occur. An "appropriation clause," empowering Parliament to apply the money thus saved to such secular purposes as it saw fit, had to be sacrificed, owing to the opposition in the House

[1] Tithes should be distinguished from church rates. The former were paid in kind for the support of the bishops and clergy. The latter were voted by the parish for the upkeep of the church fabric, and, in modern times at least, were paid in money.

of Lords. The Bill, thus shorn of its most popular feature, became law. Once more, Parliament had thrown away the chance of granting a freehanded concession. The bitterness of O'Connell and his followers was accentuated by the drastic character of the accompanying Coercion Bill. It gave the Lord Lieutenant unlimited power of suppressing public meetings and of declaring any county in a state of disturbance; in such districts inhabitants were forbidden to be out of doors between sunset and sunrise, trial by martial law was introduced, and the Habeas Corpus Act suspended.

The Abolition of Slavery in the Colonies (1833). — Stanley, in view of the hostility which he had excited in Ireland, was transferred to the office of Colonial Secretary. In his new position he carried a measure for which the abolitionists had been struggling ever since the slave trade had been done away with in 1807. Although the lot of those in bondage had been somewhat improved, the planters who were badly off — partly owing to the fall in prices after the French War, and partly owing to their own extravagance and wasteful methods — had hitherto been able to exert an influence strong enough to withstand the pressure of a growing popular sentiment. The new Bill, passed 30 August, 1833, provided for a scheme of gradual emancipation. All children under six years of age, and all born henceforth were declared free. Others were to serve an apprenticeship, giving three fourths of their time to their masters for seven years. An attempt was made to placate the planters by a grant of £20,000,000, considerably less than their estimated value of their human property. Four years of trial proved the apprentice system unworkable, so it was done away with altogether.

The Factory Act of 1833. — In this session a notable act was passed to improve the grievous lot of children employed in factories. Attention had first been called to the question in 1784, by Dr. Percival of Manchester, and subsequent investigations disclosed frightful conditions. Children as young as six years of age were worked for thirteen or fourteen hours a day in unhealthy, overheated rooms. Exhausted by long and exacting labor and without opportunities for play, sunshine, or education, they grew old before their time, but remained stunted in body and mind. Two measures were passed, slightly improving their lot, before they gained a valiant champion in Lord Ashley, later Earl of Shaftesbury. He was bitterly opposed by the bulk of manufacturers, who were, in general, supported by both parties. The Tories were averse to change, and the Whigs were advocates of the *laissez-faire* policy which aimed to minimize the interference of the State in individual concerns. Nevertheless, he was able

to carry, in a slightly modified form, a measure which he introduced in 1833. It prohibited the employment of children under nine years of age; it restricted the labor of children between nine and thirteen to forty-eight hours in a week and to nine in a single day, that of young persons — between thirteen and eighteen — to sixty-nine hours a week and to twelve in a single day. Also it provided for a system of inspection to enforce the provision of the Act, and enacted that children under thirteen should attend school for two hours a day. The regulations of 1833 applied only to the textile industries in factories, and left much to be desired in other respects; but they were the happy forerunner of later remedial legislation relating to conditions of labor.

The "New Poor Law" (1834). — In the following year, Parliament carried another measure of supreme importance — the Poor Law Amendment Act, popularly known as the "New Poor Law." The chief fault of the Elizabethan laws was that they imposed the care of the poor on the parish — a unit too small to bear the burden in districts where there was an excess of paupers. Another, and the wisest, perhaps, of the Elizabethan provisions — namely, that the able-bodied should be made to work in houses of correction, if necessary, and that the sick and helpless should be provided for in almshouses — had broken down. In 1795 certain local magistrates began the practice of supplementing inadequate wages by money allowances. This practice of "outdoor relief," which soon became general and was sanctioned by Parliament in 1796, tended to foster pauperism in more ways than one. It discouraged thrift, because many who would never have gone to the poorhouse were quite willing to receive aid in this way. It kept down wages, for it tempted employers to spare their own pockets at the expense of the rates. Furthermore, it fostered immorality, since women might be given an allowance for every one of their children whether legitimate or not. To make matters worse, iniquitous "laws of settlement," beginning with an Act of 1662, prohibited paupers from leaving the parishes where work was scarce for those where there was an abundance. The burden of the rates became crushing, causing farmers to leave their farms; in one parish there were one hundred and four paupers out of one hundred and thirty-nine inhabitants. At length, a seventh of the population came to be dependent upon the rates, which reached an annual total of £8,500,000, a situation so intolerable that a commission of investigation was appointed. Its report, February, 1834, contained five recommendations. 1. All outdoor relief, except medical aid, should be abolished. 2. Women should support their illegitimate

children. 3. The Law of Settlement should be modified in order that the poor might be free to go wherever work was plentiful. 4. Parishes should be grouped into unions, so that the prosperous might help the poorer. 5. A central poor-law board of three commissioners should be created for the supervision and control of the whole local system. In spite of the bitter opposition of the Radicals, a Bill, based on those recommendations, became law in August, 1834. The immediate result was no little suffering and intense discontent, leading even to riots; but the measure, in the long run, proved to be very highly beneficial, even though outdoor relief was never wholly discontinued.

The Split in the Liberal Ranks, and the First Peel Ministry (November, 1834–April, 1835). — Meantime, Earl Grey had resigned. For some time his Government had been declining in popularity. It had offended various special interests by its reform measures, while it had not gone far enough to content the Radicals. Its growing weakness had been brought to a head by a hopeless split in the Cabinet over the Irish question, particularly over a revival of the "Appropriation Clause" and a suspension of the Coercion Act. Grey was succeeded by Lord Melbourne (1779–1848) whose Government carried the New Poor Law. He was an old-fashioned Liberal of the *laissez-faire* school who was opposed to the restless innovating spirit of the Radicals; indeed, his favorite remark was: "Why can't you let it alone?" From these political convictions, as well as from his languid, indolent bearing — largely a pose — he got a reputation for aimlessness and lack of firmness that was hardly deserved. Contrary to the King's hopes, Melbourne and Peel would not form a coalition, so the Whig Ministry, somewhat reconstituted, was continued. Very soon, however, personal animosities developed in the Cabinet, whereupon the King accepted the resignation of Melbourne, and chose Peel as Prime Minister. Announcing his acceptance of the Reform Act as "a final and irrevocable settlement of a great constitutional question," Peel declared that, with due regard for old constitutional principles, he was prepared to proceed with the removal of abuses and the initiation of "judicious reforms." He proceeded to introduce a number, of a type which drew upon him the charge of purloining the measures of his adversaries, and which, as a matter of fact, were carried by the next Liberal Ministry. He appointed an ecclesiastical commission to inquire into abuses and inequalities existing in the Established Church; he introduced a bill to relieve Dissenters from the disabilities of the marriage laws then in force, and another to commute the English tithes into money

payments. In April, 1835, after an uphill fight, he was overthrown, yet, during his brief tenure, he had established his reputation at home and abroad as a man of capacity, bound in time to return to power.

The Second Melbourne Ministry (1835–1841), and the Municipal Reform Act (1835). — Since Grey refused to assume office the King was forced to turn again to Melbourne. The most notable achievement of the new Ministry was the reform of the municipal corporations. In 1833 a commission had been appointed to inquire into the state of the municipalities. Its report, presented early in 1835, revealed a situation crying for amendment. The Reform Bill had swept away many of the small rotten boroughs, and had improved the condition of parliamentary representation and qualifications for voting in those that remained. Its scope, however, did not extend to internal organization and administration, and town government was very generally in the hands of councils, self-elected, irresponsible and corrupt. The number of freemen, who in some cases formed the corporation, was usually limited; in Portsmouth, for instance, there were only 102 out of 46,000 inhabitants; in Cambridge 118 out of 20,000. Moreover, these freemen, usually descendants of the original ratepayers, together with others arbitrarily added for political purposes, were often poor creatures — paupers, indeed, who shared in old charitable endowments and enjoyed exemptions from tolls, as well as other burdens. The Municipal Corporations Bill, framed on the basis of the report of 1835, became law in September. It provided for drastic changes. All boroughs and cities, with the exception of London — as well as sixty-seven others omitted because of their small size — were to adopt a uniform plan of government. This was to be vested in a town council, consisting of a mayor, aldermen and councilors. The councilors were to be elected by the ratepaying occupiers, together with the freemen who had survived the Reform Bill, and were to hold office for three years, while the mayor was to be chosen annually and the aldermen every six years by the councilors. Each borough, too, might, if it chose, have a recorder, nominated by the Crown, for the conduct of its judicial work. Exclusive trading privileges were broken up, and measures were devised to prevent jobbery and thieving. For example, much business, formerly in the hands of small committees, was transferred to the whole council, whose meetings were to be public and whose accounts were to be audited annually.

The Closing Years of William's Reign (1836–1837). — In the following year a few other reforms were carried. Chief among them was

an Act converting English tithes in kind into an annual rent charge.[1] Another was a measure authorizing Dissenters to celebrate marriages in their own chapels, with a system of registration in place of banns. Civil marriages were also allowed; but the Church of England retained the practice of marrying members with banns or license. The Ecclesiastical Commission did away with many abuses, such as non-residence and pluralities, and performed a notable work in reducing the gross inequalities of episcopal and clerical incomes. Another step in advance was to allow to prisoners on trial for felony the full benefit of counsel. What with the difficulties in Ireland, the active obstructionist tactics of the Conservatives and the claims of the Radicals for more progressive measures — for the ballot and household suffrage, the repeal of the Septennial Act, the abolition of the property qualification for the House of Commons, and the reform of the House of Lords — the Ministry had stormy sailing. Such was the situation when William IV died, 20 June, 1837. He had come to the throne late in life, defective in education and with abilities far from great. Yet while he was erratic and opinionated and grew more and more timid of innovation, he was honest, well-meaning and loyal in the support of his Ministers. However much or little he contributed to the result, his reign was marked by a series of reforms unsurpassed for number and importance during any period of equal length in English history.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

Narrative. Bright, III; Brodrick and Fotheringham; Martineau; Marriott; Maxwell; Walpole; *Cambridge Modern History*, X, as above.

For Parliamentary Reform see above, ch. XLVIII. Also G. L. Dickinson, *The Development of Parliament in the Nineteenth Century* (1895). J. R. M. Butler, *The Passing of the Great Reform Bill* (1914). Charles Seymour, *Electoral Reform in England and Wales, 1832–1885* (1915), valuable. Veitch, *Genesis of Parliamentary Reform* (1913).

Biographies and Special Works. E. Ashley, *Life of Lord Palmerston* (1879), I. S. J. Reid, *Life and Letters of the First Earl of Durham* (2 vols., 1906), rather over favorable. C. Buxton, *Memoirs of Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton* (1898). Torrens, *Memoirs of Lord Melbourne* (2 vols., 1878). Sir G. O. Trevelyan, *Life and Letters of Lord Macaulay* (2 vols., 1876), a delightful book. E. Hodder, *Life of the Seventh Earl of Shaftesbury* (1887). B. L. Hutchins, *History of Factory Legislation* (1903). Sir G. Nicholls and T. Mackay, *History of the English Poor Law* (3 vols., 1904). W. Bagehot, *Biographical Studies* (1880).

Selections from the sources. Adams and Stephens, nos. 263–5. Robertson, pt. I, nos. XLVII–XLVIII; pt. II, XXVI, appendix, 430–438.

[1] Compulsory church rates were abolished in 1868, though voluntary payments still continue.

CHAPTER LI

THE EARLY YEARS OF VICTORIA'S REIGN AND THE TRIUMPH OF FREE TRADE (1837–1846)

The Victorian Age. — When Victoria began her reign of sixty-four years, nineteenth-century England had already witnessed a goodly number of reforms. The political and legal disabilities of the Protestant Dissenters and the Roman Catholics had been almost entirely removed; the most glaring defects and inequalities of the representative system had been swept away; the exclusive power of the aristocracy had been broken and the middle classes had been admitted to power; and a new humanitarian spirit had manifested itself in measures for the betterment of the lot not only of men, but of dumb animals. The prosperity of the Colonies had been fostered and the British Empire had begun to extend in a new direction. Rusty shackles which hampered the growth of trade and industry had been struck off, and new inventions and processes were in operation which were to prove revolutionary in their results. There was still much misery and suffering among the lower classes; but, before the new reign was half over, they began to share in an amazing advance in material prosperity. This was due largely to the adjustment of the masses to the new conditions of industry; to the removal of the restrictive duties which had still clung to raw materials and foodstuffs; to enlightened sanitary and labor regulations; and to the wonders achieved by steam and electricity. While the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century marked an era in production, the Victorian age marked another, even more notable, in methods of transportation and distribution.

As the Government, by the extension of the franchise to the wage earner, came to voice more nearly the popular will, it became decidedly paternal in character — utilitarian still, but socialistic instead of individualistic. While distinctions of rank and wealth continue to exist, the State has come to intervene for the interest of the masses in all sorts of activities from which it formerly held aloof; in popular

education; postal savings banks; recognition of the trade unions; purchase of lands for the tillers of the soil; regulation of various relations between the employer and the employed; old age pensions and workingmen's insurance.

Victoria. Her Early Life and Accession. — Alexandrina Victoria — for such was her full name — was born 24 May, 1819, a year before the death of her father, the Duke of Kent, fourth son of George III. While her mother — a princess of Saxe-Coburg — wisely resolved to educate the little Victoria in England, she surrounded her with German influences, seeking constant counsel from her brother Leopold, who became King of the Belgians in 1832. In the gray dawn of a June morning in 1837, Victoria was awakened from her slumbers to learn that she was Queen of England; at eleven o'clock the same morning she appeared before the Privy Council and read in a sweet, strong voice the speech which Melbourne had prepared for her. Though not five feet tall and in no sense a beauty, her dignity and graciousness made a profound impression on all those present. Hanover, where the Salic law of succession prevailed, went to her uncle the Duke of Cumberland, a separation which contributed to some degree in detaching Great Britain from Continental complications.

The Opening of the New Reign. — The Whigs, who were in power, looked to the young Queen to extend them the support which William in his later years had withdrawn. This naturally dampened whatever enthusiasm Victoria's youthful charm had evoked from the Tories. Melbourne appointed himself Victoria's political instructor. To a man of the world, verging on sixty, immersed in public business, and fond of devoting his scant leisure to scholarly pursuits, the task must have been far from congenial. On the whole, he performed his duties cheerfully, and was rewarded with the devotion of the young Queen, though, on occasion, she showed startling evidences of imperiousness and self-will. Indeed, while she later acquired more self-control, she never, to the end of her life, hesitated to express her views fully and frankly, — however, usually, as became a constitutional Sovereign, leaving her Ministers to follow their own choice. In spite of strenuous opposition on the part of the Radicals, Melbourne managed to secure for the Queen a Civil List of £385,000 annually, which was £10,000 more than her predecessor had received,[1] though the old

[1] This was over and above the hereditary revenues from Lancaster and the Duchy of Cornwall, the latter of which went to the Duke of Cornwall when there was one. In addition, the Duchess of Kent received £30,000 a year, and, subsequently, more than £200,000 annually was granted to the Prince Consort and the royal children.

pension and secret service funds amounting to £75,000 and £10,000 were done away with.[1]

Ministerial Crisis (1839). — From the very beginning of the reign the Ministry was exposed to storms from many quarters. A rebellion broke out in Canada; Ireland was very unquiet; and powerful party opposition developed at home. In the House of Commons, Peel was growing in strength and was persistent in attack, while, at the other extreme, the Radicals, in addition to demanding more political power for the masses, were contending for free trade, compulsory education, disestablishment of the Irish Church and many other reforms. Outside, the middle classes, disquieted by the prevailing evidences of unrest and by the violent speeches of agitators, were inclining toward the Conservative ranks, though the Whigs made no corresponding converts among the laboring classes. Weakened by the trend of events, the Cabinet was in no condition to resist a West Indian crisis which centered in Jamaica, where the planters, hard hit by the emancipation of their slaves, and by the abolition of the apprenticeship system four years later, overworked and underfed the freedmen — many of whom were idle and unruly, no doubt — and had the recalcitrant cruelly flogged in the houses of correction. This started a new wave of sentiment in favor of the blacks, and the Government was forced to frame measures for the regulation of the prison conditions. The result was to produce such manifestations of disaffection among the planters that a bill was introduced into Parliament, 9 April, 1839, to suspend the Jamaica Constitution for five years, a bill, which, in spite of the provocation which prompted it, was so drastic and so fraught with dangerous possibilities that it only carried in the Commons by a majority of five. Melbourne, realizing that his situation was hopeless, resigned early in May, 1839.

The Bed-Chamber Question (1839). — He was brought back to office again by a curious episode known as the Bed-Chamber Question; for which the Queen, Melbourne, and Peel must all share the blame. Victoria, bitterly grieved at the loss of her beloved counselor, sent first for Wellington; but, upon his refusal to form a Ministry, she turned to Peel. Since most of her lady attendants were representatives of the Whig families, he felt the necessity of substituting a few associated with his own party. He had no intention of making a clean sweep, but merely desired to remove the Mistress of the Robes and two or three of the ladies-in-waiting; yet unfortunately — and here

[1] However, the Queen was allowed £1200 a year to reward contributions to art and literature and other non-political public services, as well as to assist meritorious persons in need of help.

was his blunder — he did not make this clear. Victoria became enraged and refused to make any changes, declaring that such a step was "contrary to usage" and "repugnant to her feelings." Peel replied that there must be some misunderstanding and stubbornly declined to form a Ministry. The Queen was much elated, and turned again to Melbourne, who seems to have supported her in her uncompromising attitude; moreover, he was induced with some difficulty to resume office. Whether he was moved by weak good nature or by chivalrous devotion, he made a mistake. The Queen herself afterwards confessed that she had acted hastily. Peel was quite right in not forming an Administration so long as the wives and other relatives of his political opponents had the ear of an inexperienced ruler, but his lack of tact and exaggerated suspicions alienated many. The Bed-Chamber Question never occurred again. It became the settled practice for the Mistress of the Robes to be changed with each new Government; the other places were no longer considered political, though the ladies of the household ceased to be drawn from one party.

The Queen's Marriage (10 February, 1840). — Early in 1840 Victoria contracted a marriage with a Prince whose wise and sober counsels contributed greatly to curb her masterful and impetuous temper. Albert of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha was her first cousin. Their Uncle Leopold looked forward to the match from their earliest youth; but the final choice was really made by the Queen from a list of possible suitors. And the pair felt a devotion for one another almost unexampled in alliances of State. The marriage announcement, hailed with joy by many, was condemned by the Tory party leaders. Albert's German birth gave them a handle, and the Queen intensified the opposition by the demands which she made on his behalf. In the first place she was so insistent that he be created King-Consort that Melbourne was finally driven to declare: "For God's sake, Madam, let's have no more of this!"[1] Another cause of friction developed when he assumed the office of royal private secretary. Prejudice against foreigners and fear of his influence over the Queen enabled his opponents, for some time, to limit his activity. Gradually, however, as his prudence and capacity came to be appreciated, he gained an increasing share in public business, he assumed most of the responsibilities properly belonging to the Queen, and in fact, if not in name, became with her the joint ruler of the nation. Yet it is questionable whether Albert became really popular. He had many admirable qualities: he was highly educated and accomplished; he was public-

[1] He was subsequently created Prince Consort by royal letters patent in 1857.

spirited and charitable; but he had no fondness for English sports or for ordinary society, and was self-absorbed, cold and formal.

Stockdale *vs.* Hansard (1839–1840). — Meantime, an important constitutional issue was being worked out. In 1835 reports and other papers published by Parliament were for the first time placed on sale for the public. In the following year, the inspectors of the prisons in their first report referred to a book which they found in circulation at Newgate, as disgusting and indecent. Stockdale, the publisher, proceeded to bring a suit against Hansard, the printer of the report. Hansard pleaded, first, that the publication, being authorized by the House of Commons, was privileged, and, second, that the libel was true. The jury found for the defendant on the second issue; but the Lord Chief Justice declared, in his charge, that an order of the House of Commons was not sufficient justification "for any bookseller who published a parliamentary report containing a libel against any man." The Commons at once took up the matter and passed a resolution challenging this decision as a breach of parliamentary privilege. A sharp quarrel developed which was only settled when the Ministry, in April, 1840, carried a bill providing that such actions as that of Stockdale *vs.* Hansard should be stayed on the production of a certificate that the matter complained of was printed by order of either House of Parliament. While the judges did not feel themselves bound by the resolutions of the Lower House, they had to yield to a Statute.

Penny Postage (1839–1840). — The declining years of the second Melbourne Administration were notable for the introduction of the adhesive stamp and of a uniform penny postage for letters, under half an ounce in weight, sent to any point in the United Kingdom. This reform, which, going into effect in January, 1840, revolutionized communication, was due to Rowland Hill, who published a pamphlet on *Post Office Reform* in 1837. Hitherto, rates had not only been exorbitant, but had varied according to the size, weight and shape of the letter. It cost a shilling from London to Aberdeen or Belfast, and the average price was sixpence. To evade the extreme charges an extensive system of smuggling developed, and it is said that five sixths of the letters between London and Manchester were conveyed illicitly.[1] Rowland Hill, when he set about investigating

[1] One device noted by the poet Coleridge was very ingenious. He saw a postman deliver a letter to a woman at a poor cottage. After looking at it, she declared she could not pay the shilling charged. Much against her will, Coleridge paid for it. When the postman had gone, she explained that, by an arrangement between her brother and herself, he sent her a blank sheet every three months to inform her that he was well.

the subject, came to the conclusion that the cost of sending mail was trifling, that the distance made little difference, and the profit increased with the number of letters sent. One of the chief advantages of this system was the immense amount of labor saved in measuring every letter and calculating the distance it had come. In spite of its merits it had to encounter a storm of opposition, though Rowland Hill is now recognized as one of the great practical reformers of the nineteenth century.

Popular Discontent. — The working classes, who had hoped much from the Reform Bill and the legislation which followed, were grievously disappointed when they realized that the chief result had been merely to shift the balance of power from the landed aristocracy to the merchant and manufacturing capitalist. Many causes contributed to accentuate their misery and discontent. A series of bad harvests, beginning in 1837, brought intense suffering, while the high protective tariff prevented any relief from the importation of foodstuffs. Moreover, the lesser folk had not yet adjusted themeslves to the vast industrial changes following the introduction of machinery during the last half century. People flocked from the country to the towns, which grew too fast to absorb them. Poverty, overcrowding, and horrible sanitary conditions prevailed. Families were huddled together in narrow filthy streets, often in dark and ill-smelling cellars. No provision was made for drainage or ventilation. Men, women, and children worked long hours for the scantiest wages.[1] The *laissez-faire* doctrines, which dominated political and economic philosophy, preached unrestricted competition, and stoutly opposed State intervention for regulating conditions of industry and helping the laborer. Private charity had neither the organization nor the will to render much aid, and the New Poor Law caused much immediate hardship, leaving to the destitute no alternative between starvation and the workhouse, where the inmates were subjected to injustice, deprivation and cruelty, of which Dickens' *Oliver Twist* presents a stirring picture. Conditions were in making which were to lead to better things, but as yet none of them were realities.

The Beginnings of the Socialistic Movement. — The revolt against the existing situation was manifested in three distinct movements — Socialism and Trade-Unionism; Chartism; and Anti-Corn-Law agitation. The pioneer of the socialists was Robert Owen (1771–1858) who from a shop assistant rose to be a rich cotton manufacturer. He established schools for the poor, he labored for improved factory condi-

[1] Graphic pictures may be found in Disraeli's *Sybil*, and Mrs. Gaskell's *Mary Barton*.

tions, and advocated coöperative production, and, about 1834, the part of his program which aimed at the control of production by the workingmen began to be enthusiastically agitated. The chief agencies for carrying on the propaganda were the Trade-Unions,[1] which beginning to come into being in 1829, aimed to limit the hours of work and to raise wages, mainly by means of "strikes." The Grand National Consolidated Trades Union, which was started in 1834 and soon numbered half a million members, undertook to group together the various local societies and was even extended to the agriculturalists; but owing to the energetic action of the employers who dismissed their men belonging to the Union, and to the hostile attitude of the Government who sentenced half a dozen of the members to transportation, the movement collapsed. It was years before Trades-Unionism became an effective force.

Chartism. The First Phase, to 1839. — Chartism and Socialism have sometimes been confused, but their methods were essentially different; they had nothing in common except a desire to improve the condition of the laboring classes. The Chartist movement may be traced to a Workingman's Association founded in London in 1836, which developed into an organization for extending the political powers of the people. This was totally at variance with the aims of Owen and his adherents, who did not believe in political remedies. In 1837 the Association embodied its demands in a petition containing six points: (1) manhood suffrage; (2) vote by ballot; (3) abolition of the property qualification for membership in Parliament; (4) payment of members; (5) equal electoral districts; and (6) annual parliaments. The movement got its name from this "Charter," as Daniel O'Connell called it. Most of the reforms it contained had been urged by the Radicals since the beginning of the century, and, with the exception of the last in the list, all of them have since been conceded. The Chartist agitation as such, however, after an intermittent and stormy history, collapsed, though for a time it was very active and soon reached a violent stage. The Charter was published in May, 1838, organizations were formed in various parts of the country and huge meetings were held to further the work. Unfortunately the movement passed beyond the control of the Workingman's Association who had framed the original program. The moderates withdrew and the violent or physical force party became supreme. So when Parliament rejected the Chartist petition and when the police sought to suppress their meetings, riots resulted, and three of their leaders were convicted and sentenced to transportation for life. This,

[1] While Owen was socialistic, Trade-Unionism is by no means necessarily so.

and the lack of any controlling mind, put an end to the Chartist agitation for some years. Perhaps even more decisive was the fact that the leading Chartists opposed the Anti-Corn-Law movement, which was in the hands of sober, earnest men of the middle classes. The majority preferred cheap bread to the vague possibilities of a political millennium promised by extremists and visionaries.

The Anti-Corn-Law Movement (1838–1841). — The center of the agitation for free trade was the manufacturing district in and about Manchester. The Manchester School of politicians saw that it was for their advantage to have not only cheap raw materials but also cheap food for those whom they employed. A period of stagnation resulting in scarcity of work and reduction of wages gave the impetus, and, in 1838, the Anti-Corn-Law League was organized. Large amounts of money were subscribed, hundreds of thousands of pamphlets were issued, and lecturers were sent all over the country to bring the question before the people. The leaders of the movement were Richard Cobden (1804–1865) and John Bright (1811–1889). Both were manufacturers, from middle class stock. The older man by his gift of persuasive reasonableness, and the younger by his powers of oratory, unequaled in his generation, formed a combination that proved irresistible on the platform and in the House of Commons. But they had a long up-hill struggle against vested interests and ingrained prejudice.

The Second Ministry of Peel (1841–1846). — In 1841 the decrepit Melbourne Ministry, which since 1839 had been staggering along against a growing Tory opposition and with a steadily swelling deficit, was finally overthrown. Thereupon Peel once more assumed the reins as Prime Minister. The deficit was the most pressing problem that confronted him, and he proceeded to deal with it in 1842. For one thing, out of 1200 dutiable articles he reduced the tariff on 750, which were grouped in three classes: raw materials, which were to pay 5 per cent; partly manufactured goods, 12 per cent; and completed products, 20 per cent. Then, in order to provide against possible loss of revenue and to meet the deficit, he revived the Income Tax,[1] abolished at the close of the French War. In 1843 the import and export duties on wool were swept away entirely. Peel had been put into office pledged to protection, and while he had not yet abandoned protectionist principles, he had taken such a long step in the direction of free trade that his followers began to ask: "Whither will he lead us?"

[1] *7d.* was imposed in every £100 on all incomes over £150. At varying rates the Income Tax has proved a main source of British revenue ever since.

The Bank Charter Act of 1844. — Peel's Bank Charter Act of 1844, though it has not escaped criticism, was a notable achievement, designed to meet a real danger. Sanctioned by an Act of 1833, joint-stock banks had, during the two following years, increased from fifty-five to a hundred, and went on growing, though less rapidly, as well as putting forth many branches. While they were issuing great quantities of paper money, vast amounts of gold were being shipped to the United States to meet the demands of an abnormal growth of business and speculation. Meantime, a financial reaction had set in, and by the close of 1836 England was on the verge of a crisis. She passed it safely; but at the expense of a shrinkage in business which led to misery and discontent, manifesting itself in riots, Chartism, and Anti-Corn-Law agitation. Peel undertook a banking reform for two reasons. As a politician he was opposed to a policy which led to commercial depression and popular unrest, as a financier he disapproved of a system which permitted an indefinite increase of paper money that did not rest on adequate basis of bullion. By the Act of 1844 he provided for a separation of the department of the Bank of England which issued notes from that conducting ordinary banking business. Henceforth, too, the issues of the Bank were to be covered by bullion, three fourths in gold, except for £14,000,000 covered by Government securities.[1]

The Second Free Trade Budget (1845). — By retaining the Income Tax Peel was able, in 1845, to abolish more duties and further to reduce others. Export duties were done away with altogether, likewise the duty on cotton, and the excise on glass. The protectionist contingent found a champion in Benjamin Disraeli (1804–1881). He came of a Jewish family who had embraced the Christian faith, and he had first come into prominence as a dandy and a writer of novels. Entering Parliament as a radical Tory, his first speech, while in a way a failure, marked him to the discerning as an unusual man. Gradually he gathered about him a group known as the Young England party, which did not long survive. Its guiding aim was a union of the Sovereign and the nobility with the masses against the middle class capitalists. He soon began to dazzle the Commons by his brilliancy; but it required persistent effort before he could win their confidence. When Peel formed his Ministry he asked him for office, a fact which he afterwards unscrupulously denied. However, he refrained from attacking his leader until the latter began to depart from protectionist

[1] Peel wished also to prohibit the note issues of the country banks, but went no further than prohibiting the new ones from issuing notes, limiting the old ones to the existing amounts and requiring weekly reports.

principles. Then he turned on him all his marvelous powers of ready and biting invective. He denounced the Conservative Government as an "organized hypocrisy." The Prime Minister, he declared, had caught the Whigs bathing and had run away with their clothes. The analogy was more clever than correct. It was the liberal Tories, Huskisson and Canning, who had made the first move in the direction of free trade, while the Whigs as a party had not as yet shown any enthusiasm for the policy. Meantime, the Anti-Corn-Law League had become a great fact. Subscriptions which had begun at £5000 in 1839 had increased in 1844 to nearly £90,000. The victory of free trade was not far off.

Regulation of Labor in Mines and Factories (1843–1844). — Meantime, laudable steps were taken to improve conditions of labor in mines and factories. The leader in this movement was Lord Ashley, who had carried the Factory Act of 1833. His efforts met determined resistance from many quarters, for the *laissez-faire* politicians and economists were opposed to any interference with free competition, employers wanted long hours and cheap labor, while parents, failing to realize that employment of women and children kept down the level of wages, were desirous to have every possible member of the family at work. Peel expressed the opinion that further labor restrictions would drive capitalists out of England; the Manchester School, sad to say, took the same attitude. Nevertheless the growing humanitarian sentiment prevailed, and Ashley secured the appointment of a commission to inquire into conditions in mines and factories. Its report, published in 1842, was an "awful document" which called forth a feeling of "shame, terror and indignation." In some places children of four years were found at work, the mines were often stifling and dripping with wet, women and children had to crawl on their hands and knees along passages from two to three feet high, dragging heavy carts by chains passing between their legs and fastened by girdles around their waists. Frequently they were forced to toil on alternate days from sixteen to twenty hours out of the twenty-four. The moral effect of such degrading labor without education or recreation can only be imagined. Ashley managed to carry a bill, in 1842, excluding women from the mines altogether. He proposed to exclude boys under thirteen as well, but had to submit to an amendment of the House of Lords admitting those over ten for three days a week. He then returned to the factory question, and with the help of Peel a bill was passed, in 1844, which limited the hours of women to twelve. The hours of children under thirteen were reduced from nine to six and a half. Peel, who had come

to see the light, only secured the passage of the measure by threatening to resign.[1]

The Potato Famine and Peel's Conversion to Free Trade (1845). — In the autumn of the year 1845 the failure of the potato crop brought about a crisis in English history. A disease, first noticed in the Isle of Wight, spread rapidly over England and Ireland. The Irish crop was ruined, and since potatoes constituted almost the sole food of the population, famine impended unless prompt measures were taken for their relief. Peel, who was already inclining to the view of Cobden and Bright, was convinced by the necessity of supplying the Irish sufferers with cheap bread from abroad, that the time had come for removing the duty on foreign corn. He had already gone so far as to admit the principle of free trade. Conceding that prices should be low for the sake of the consumer rather than high for the sake of the producer, he had clung to a moderate duty on corn in order to encourage its production that Great Britain might be self-sufficing in time of war. Moreover, he was the Prime Minister of a party pledged to protect the agricultural interests. But his reduction of duties in 1842 had resulted in increased prosperity, and he had made up his mind that free trade was "in the interest of the country and politically inevitable." The only question was whether he should undertake the task or leave it to the Whigs, for their leader Russell had also reached the point of discarding the principles of protection. Peel discussed the question with his Cabinet in a series of meetings during October and November; but only three of his colleagues would support his views, hence, a proposal which he made to suspend temporarily the restriction on the import of corn and to call a Parliament to consider the whole subject of repeal, was rejected. While the Cabinet was thus at odds, Russell, 22 November, threw a bombshell by publishing a famous document, known to history as the "Edinburgh Letter," in which he declared for free trade. "Let us unite," he wrote, "to put an end to a system which has been proved to be the blight of commerce, the bane of agriculture, the source of bitter divisions among classes, the cause of penury, fever, mortality and crime among the people." Bright assured the Whig leader that his letter had made "the total and immediate repeal of the Corn Laws inevitable." Peel, spurred on by Russell's pronouncement, strove to induce his Cabinet to forestall the Whigs by framing a repeal measure and summoning Parliament to vote upon it. Meeting another

[1] The ten-hour day for women and young persons was not secured till 1850. Various other regulations and extensions followed, which were consolidated into the existing labor code in 1901.

refusal, he resigned, 5 December. Russell was called upon to form a Government. Finding difficulties in the distribution of offices he soon gave up the task, apparently not overanxious to fish in the troubled waters which he had stirred up. Accordingly Peel came back, 20 December.

The Repeal of the Corn Laws (June, 1846). — Parliament met 22 January, 1846. Peel began the fight by proposing a further reduction of the duties — provided for in 1842 and 1845 — to 10 per cent on manufactured goods, to 5 per cent on those partly manufactured, and for the total removal of all imposts on raw materials. This he followed by a proposal for materially lowering the sliding scale of duties on corn — adopted in 1828 — during a period of three years with the stipulation that on 1 February, 1849, the scale was to be abolished, leaving only a nominal duty of one shilling a quarter. Immediately, a large section of the Conservatives arose in revolt. Their real leader was Disraeli. Realizing, however, the magic of a noble name and powerful family connections in managing the Tory aristocracy, he chose as nominal chief Lord George Bentinck, a son of the Duke of Portland. Disraeli delighted his supporters and confounded his opponents by his sarcasm, his brilliant rhetoric, and his audacious party tactics. He denounced Peel "as a man who never originates an idea; a man who takes his observations, and when he finds the wind in a particular quarter trims his sails to suit it," as "a trader on other people's intelligence; a political burglar of other men's ideas." He led in the furious outcry that the Prime Minister had betrayed the Conservative party, and sought to obstruct his measures at every stage of their progress. The Protectionists were willing to accept a temporary suspension of the corn duties which Peel had framed as a special measure for meeting the Irish distress, but they contended that there was no reason for a drastic free trade policy at the same time. Naturally, there was hostility, on the part of special interests, to the proposals relating to raw materials and manufactures; but Peel was able to show that every decrease of the duty had been followed by increase of business and employment. To the landed gentry, who were fighting so desperately against the repeal of the Corn Laws, his argument was that the welfare of the country and the very existence of the poor demanded cheap food and steady prices. After two months of struggle, both the Corn Bill and the Customs Bill passed the Commons, 15 May. Thanks to Wellington, who again showed his common sense in foreseeing the inevitable, the Lords yielded, 25 June.

The Fall of Peel. — On the very same day "the Ministry who had carried to success the greatest piece of legislation. . . since Lord Grey's

Reform Bill," was overthrown. The distress in Ireland had so accentuated the unrest that a new Coercion bill — the eighteenth since the Union — was introduced into the House of Lords in March. It passed the Upper House, but Disraeli, with the help of the Irish and Radical members, succeeded in defeating it in the Commons.

Estimate of His Work. — The extension of the free trade policy was fortunate in coming in on a wave of great material prosperity for England, and protection was soon abandoned as a political issue. A marvelous development followed. Many causes were operative, in addition to the recent legislation, such as the final adjustment of the laborer to the factory system, wonderful improvements in machinery, and the phenomenal development of railway and steam traffic and the introduction of electricity. However much Peel's measures may have contributed to the new era, he certainly understood and represented the commercial interests of the country better than any other Englishman of the century. He never came back to office; but during the rest of his life headed an opposition band consisting of a few devoted followers known as the "Peelites." He died 2 July, 1850, as the result of a fall from his horse a few days before. For forty years he had been a member of the House of Commons, and for half that period he had led his party in office and in opposition. His power in the Cabinet and in Parliament was due to his mastery of detail and the weight of his reasoning rather than to any fervor of oratory. His public policy, though it exposed him at times to the charge of inconsistency, had a fundamental unity; namely, to preserve the existing Constitution so far as possible, yet at the same time to improve the condition of the country by progressive legislation. Bound by conservative tradition and lacking in imaginative foresight, he was open to new ideas which on occasion led him to depart abruptly from his party allegiance, and resulted finally in producing a split in the Conservative ranks. Always ready to sacrifice himself and his party to the public good, his monument endures in the revival of the specie payments; the reform of the criminal code; Roman Catholic emancipation; the improvement of the banking system; the reduction of the tariff and the repeal of the Corn Laws. Judged both by his work and his character he ranks as the foremost statesman of his generation.

Foreign Affairs. The Opium War (1840–1842). — Under Grey and Melbourne the control of foreign affairs was in the hands of Lord Palmerston, whose policy was marked by an aggressive sympathy with liberal and national movements against despotism. The more conciliatory Aberdeen, who succeeded to the Foreign Office under Peel, inherited wars with Afghanistan and China, disputes with the United

States, and strained relations with France. The war with China is one of the most discreditable in British history; for, however great the provocation which led Great Britain to assume the offensive, the trouble really had its root in her attempt to force the opium trade upon the Chinese against the protestations of their Government and of such public opinion as there was in the Empire. Palmerston tried to obscure the moral issue by insisting that the question was one of protecting the native-grown poppy and of preventing the export of bullion. Whatever their motives, the Chinese had absolutely prohibited the importation of the drug. Their general policy at this time was to exclude all foreign commerce so far as possible. Certain foreign merchants, however, from their headquarters in the island of Hong-Kong had been allowed to engage in a very restricted business with the neighboring city of Canton. In addition to this licensed trade, considerable smuggling in opium had sprung up. Up to 1834 the monopoly of the China trade had been in the hands of the East India Company, who had kept both the recognized and the illicit traffic under reasonable control. With the cessation of the Company's exclusive privileges, conditions got so bad that the British Government appointed officials to supervise the licensed commerce and to check the smuggling. But the Chinese refused to recognize these superintendents and treated them in a very high-handed fashion. This discord gave the smugglers increased opportunities, from which they were not slow to profit. The Chinese, taking matters into their own hands, seized and destroyed some 20,000 chests of opium in the Canton River. Other causes of friction followed, and a British fleet was sent to the scene of action in 1840. The Chinese were finally brought to terms. By the treaty of Nankin, 26 August, 1842: (1) Five ports, including Canton and Shanghai, were opened to British trade; (2) Hong-Kong was ceded outright; (3) and 21,000,000 dollars was paid for the opium destroyed, for debts due to British merchants, and for a war indemnity. The Chinese, however, still refused to legalize the opium trade. Unhappily, owing to the fact that the growth and sale of the drug formed a chief source of the Indian revenue, the British Government would take no steps to stop the traffic, which went on for years unchecked. In other respects the commercial results of the treaty proved an advantage for both sides.

Boundary Disputes with the United States Adjusted (1842 and 1846). — Chief among the outstanding disputes with the United States were those relating to the northeast and northwest boundaries. Lord Ashburton, sent on a special mission, was unable to settle the Oregon boundary, but managed to adjust the limits of northern Maine, which had

been a subject of controversy since 1783. By the Ashburton Treaty a compromise was arranged. The United States accepted a line in northern Maine south of that which they had originally claimed; but they received a clear title to Rouse's Point on Lake Champlain, where they had built a fort on the supposition that it was within the limits of the United States, though a later and more accurate survey had shown that it is really in British territory. The question of the boundary west of the Rockies was not settled till 1846. Each country had conflicting claims based on discovery, exploration and settlement. In 1818 they agreed to occupy the disputed territory jointly and the northern boundary of the United States was fixed at 49° between the Lake of the Woods and the Stony (Rocky) Mountains.[1] By the Florida Treaty of 1819 the United States acquired such claims as the Spanish had north of 42°. In 1824 Russia gave up all claims south of 54° 40′. The Anglo-American joint occupancy proved unsatisfactory, and by the Oregon Treaty, as finally concluded, the boundary of 49° was extended from the Rockies as far as Vancouver Sound, and thence along the middle of the channel to the sea. The British thus secured the whole of Vancouver Island. The navigation of the Columbia River was to be free to both countries.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

See Chapter LII below.

[1] The boundary to the Mississippi had been fixed by the treaty of 1783. In the interval between that date and 1818 the United States had acquired Louisiana.

CHAPTER LII

REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENTS IN EUROPE AND THE BEGINNING OF A NEW PERIOD OF WAR (1846–1856). THE PALMERSTONIAN RÉGIME AND THE END OF AN EPOCH (1857–1865)

The First Russell Ministry (1846–1852). Temporary Measures for Irish Relief. — Lord John Russell, who succeeded Peel, was confronted first with the pressing problem of relieving the destitution and dealing with the disturbances in Ireland, where the misery was accentuated by a second potato blight in 1846. Father Mathew records that, on a journey from Dublin to Cork early in August, he "beheld with sorrow one wild waste of putrefying vegetation. Stupor and despair fell upon the people. In many places the wretched men were seated on the fences of their decaying gardens wringing their hands, and wailing bitterly at the destruction which had left them foodless." Peel had hurried a supply of Indian corn to the stricken country and had advanced, on the part of the Government, a considerable sum for employing the people on public works. The debt was to be assumed partly by the State and partly by the localities, but the terms of the loan proved so easy that the landlords took advantage of them to improve their estates and Peel's plan was soon abandoned. Russell started a new system of public works providing that the money should be repaid by the localities within ten years at $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. His system, too, proved ineffective and extravagant. The employment selected was usually the building of roads which led nowhere; light work and certain wages attracted men from necessary employments, and the numbers swelling from 100,000 in October, 1846, to 734,000 in March, 1847, became unmanageable, so that his system also had to be given up. Furthermore, in accordance with the prevailing *laissez-faire* policy, the Government food depots were not opened while food could be sold at a reasonable price, consequently speculators throve and the people starved. After something had been done by volunteer committees, Russell, early in 1847, provided a system for the free dispen-

sation of food, supplied partly from Government funds and partly from local rates, a more effective system which was continued till the harvest season of 1847. In addition the Corn Laws and the Navigation Laws were temporarily suspended during 1846 and 1847.[1]

Permanent Measures. — Since these devices, necessary as they seemed, tended to pauperize the Irish, the Government undertook to frame more permanent measures for stimulating enterprise and developing the country, as well as assisting the needy. Unfortunately, the evils resulting from unrestricted competition in rents, tenure at will, and arbitrary evictions were left untouched, while a proposal for reclaiming waste lands and selling them in small lots was defeated. Considerable sums, however, were advanced for draining and improving estates. One measure, the Encumbered Estates Act of 1848, very well meant, was exceedingly unfortunate in its results. The object was to enable impoverished landlords to sell out to those who were financially able to work the estates, yet, as a rule, the tenants suffered from the change; since most of the new proprietors were greedy capitalists seeking to wring the utmost farthing from their investment. While the progress of starvation was gradually checked, the effects of the famine ran their course. The mortality due to fever and suffering was dreadful. Murder and violence increased so alarmingly that the Liberals, who in opposition had helped to defeat Peel's Coercion Bill, were reduced to passing one of their own, December, 1847. Conditions were ripe for revolt when a series of revolutions on the Continent precipitated an abortive Irish rising.

The Young Ireland Rising (1848). — As in 1789 and in 1830 the movement started in Paris, resulting in the expulsion of Louis Philippe from the throne and the establishment of a short-lived republic. Some years before, Daniel O'Connell had lost his influence with the bolder spirits of his party because he was unwilling to resort to force to gain his cherished end — repeal of the Union. He died at Genoa in 1847, a broken old man. Meantime, the leadership passed to the Young Ireland party, which began with a group of youthful journalists, who founded the *Nation* newspaper, in 1842, where they published prose and poetry breathing all the fervor of the patriots of antiquity. The French example and the hope of French assistance converted the young Ireland party into a body of rebellious conspirators. They had chosen

[1] Apparently a wiser method of dealing with the whole problem would have been to suspend the collection of rents and the export of cereals by which the tenantry secured the money to pay them, for sufficient foodstuffs were sent out of the country in 1845 to feed the whole population for six months.

as their leader William Smith O'Brien, a Protestant of wealth and ancient lineage, who originally supported O'Connell's policy of peaceful agitation. He was honest, courageous and patriotic, but lacked the decision and the personal magnetism necessary to head a successful revolt. After he had failed in a mission to Paris, where he sought aid, he planned a rising which was scattered by the police, 29 July, before he could completely organize his forces, and, together with a few of the ringleaders in the attempted rising, was sentenced to death for high treason, a sentence subsequently commuted to exile. Danger of revolution ceased for the time being; but the misery and discontent which had fomented it remained.

The Collapse of the Chartists (1848). — Aside from the abortive Irish rising, the only other effect of the rebellions of 1848 which the British Government had to face was a revival of Chartism, and that was to some extent due to a threatened financial crisis which drove many out of employment. Early in 1848, meetings began to be held in the large towns, and a petition was circulated which received thousands of signatures. On 4 April a convention was opened in London, and a plan was adopted to assemble on the 10th, to march in procession to Parliament, and present the monster petition. The Duke of Wellington, commissioned by the Government to guard against insurrection, caused 170,000 constables to be sworn in and held the regular troops in readiness. In view of these preparations, their leader, Fergus O'Connor, losing his courage, gave up the procession and urged his followers to disperse. The petition was sent in three cabs, purporting to contain 5,000,000 names; less than half that number were found by actual count, and many of them were fictitious. Led by visionaries, distracted by conflicting aims, discredited by the violence of the extremists and rendered ridiculous by a final futile demonstration, the Chartist movement, as such, collapsed. Nevertheless, it was fostered by real distress, it was joined by many honest workmen, and most of its demands have since become the law of the land.

The "Papal Aggression" (1850). — Two years later, popular apprehension was stirred to a fever heat from a totally different cause — the so-called "Papal Aggression." Impressed by the fact that a few men of note had recently gone over to Rome, the Pope and the Vatican had hopes that the time was ripe for the conversion of England. To that end, a papal bull was issued, in 1850, setting up a hierarchy of bishops in England, who should derive their titles from English sees created by the bull. Hitherto, Roman Catholic bishops sent to that country had been known as bishops *in partibus infidelium*. Deriving

their titles from extinct dioceses in Asia Minor, they had been regarded as missionaries dwelling in a land of unbelievers. While to many it was a matter of indifference whether the new prelates had English or Asiatic titles, numbers of good people, who had viewed with concern the Romeward tendency of the High Anglican party, were convinced that Pius IX was seizing the opportunity to attempt to extend the spiritual arm of the Church of Rome over the whole of Great Britain. Russell added fuel to the flames by a famous letter to the Bishop of Durham denouncing the Pope's assumption of authority as "inconsistent with the Queen's supremacy, with the rights of our bishops and clergy, and with the spiritual independence of the nation as asserted even in the Roman Catholic times." The day after the letter appeared was Guy Fawkes' Day, which furnished the occasion for parading effigies, particularly of the Pope, for bonfires and other wild demonstrations in London and elsewhere. Resolutions from tumultuous meetings, and floods of petitions addressed to the Queen and the Ministers called for urgent action.

The Ecclesiastical Titles Bill (1851). — Curiously enough, the Prime Minister who had done so much to stir the popular prejudice was one of the leading advocates in his generation of religious freedom. After all, neither he nor his colleagues, having called attention to the threatened danger, wanted to undertake decisive legislation. In order, however, to allay the excitement and possibly to discourage further papal activity in England, Russell, early in 1851, introduced the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill. The measure, which only passed after long and acrimonious discussion, forbade, under penalty, the assumption by Roman Catholics of titles taken from any territory or place within the United Kingdom, and declared void anything done under such titles. As a matter of fact, it remained a dead letter and was quietly repealed in 1871.

The Great Exhibition (1851). — During the year 1851, attention was drawn from politics toward a remarkable undertaking for which Prince Albert was chiefly responsible. This was an exhibition of the industries of all nations — the first of a long series to follow which have done so much to bring peoples of different nations together, to widen their horizon by travel and mutual acquaintance, and to further industrial and artistic progress. The Great Exhibition, held in Hyde Park from 1 May to 15 October, was, in one of its results, most disappointing. Although it was predicted confidently that it would mark an era in the cause of international peace, the first Continental war in forty years soon broke out, and was followed by a long and frequent series of European conflicts.

The Palmerstonian Policy and the Don Pacifico Case. — The irresponsible Palmerston had a remarkable gift for sensing and voicing English public opinion in the field of his Secretaryship — foreign affairs; but by his jaunty aggressiveness, his habit of scolding other Governments and meddling in their affairs, and by his tendency to follow his own bent, he was constantly stirring up trouble abroad and embarrassing the Queen and the Cabinet. The Prince Consort and the Queen, though they accepted the constitutional system in England and would not have objected to seeing it adopted voluntarily by European Sovereigns, were firm supporters of the existing dynasties — particularly that of Germany, with which they had close family connections — and shuddered at violent attacks on them. Palmerston's attitude was hopelessly at variance with theirs; he was a strenuous advocate of liberal and national movements abroad, and went to the point of encouraging or at least condoning revolution. Not only his policy but his manner of proceeding was intolerable to his Sovereign and her Consort. Albert's views he treated with undisguised contempt when he did not ignore them altogether. A notion of his methods may be gained from the fact that in 1848, without consulting even the Queen, he sent a mandate to the Spanish Government to liberalize its institutions, a proceeding which led to the recall of the British ambassador. More than once he brought Great Britain to the verge of war with France, and by his procedure in the Don Pacifico case even ran the risk of provoking a general European conflict. Don Pacifico, a Jew who had moved to Athens from Gibraltar where he had lived as a British subject, claimed the protection of the British Government when, in an Easter demonstration in 1847, his house was sacked by an Athenian mob. Palmerston, without consulting France or Russia — who were joined by treaty for safeguarding the interest of Greece — and regardless of the efforts of the French and British ambassadors who were adjusting the matter in London, sent a fleet to the Piraeus and put pressure on the Greeks. Impelled partly by a feeling that the French and Russians were in a league, through their ambassadors in Athens, against Great Britain, his chief defense, in a remarkable speech in the House of Commons, was that he had acted on the principle that anyone who bore the name of Englishman was entitled to protection. Working up to a passionate climax, he left the House to decide " whether, as the Roman in days of old held himself free from indignity when he could say *civis Romanus sum*, so also a British subject, in whatever land he may be, shall feel confident that the watchful eye and strong arm of England will protect him against injustice and wrong." It was a telling appeal to British pride. It mattered

little that Don Pacifico claimed damages that were ridiculously exorbitant. He did not get all he asked, though he recovered probably more than he had lost.

The Queen's Memorandum to Palmerston (12 August, 1850). — Another source of friction in the British foreign relations was due to the fact that many Continental Sovereigns, thinking that the Queen was all-powerful, addressed their correspondence directly to her. While she conscientiously referred such communications as were of importance to Palmerston, she usually received advice so inconsiderate and unconciliatory as to cause her pain. When Russell remonstrated with him for this and for his tendency to act without consultation, he tossed it off with the remark that the Queen showed "groundless uneasiness." After some delay and hesitation, Victoria, 12 August, 1850, sent the Foreign Secretary a memorial which should govern his conduct in the future. "She expects," so it ran, "to be kept informed of what passes between him and the Foreign Ministers before important decisions are taken," and required in addition: "First, that the Foreign Secretary will distinctly state what he proposes in a given case, in order that the Queen may know as distinctly to what she has given her royal sanction. Second, having once given her sanction to a measure, that it be not arbitrarily altered or modified by the Minister," under penalty of dismissal. The buoyant Palmerston expressed seeming surprise that he had offended, made assuring promises for the future, but went on in his old way. It was not long before he gave the Queen an opportunity to dismiss him.

His Resignation (19 December, 1851). — On the 2d December, 1851, Louis Napoleon, the President of the French Republic, by a celebrated *coup d'état* overthrew his opponents and made himself absolute head of the State. Although Palmerston was in general opposed to despotism, and even distrusted Louis Napoleon, he feared still more a restoration of the hated Orleanist dynasty. So, again without consulting the Queen or even his colleagues, he first expressed, in a private conversation with the French Ambassador in London, his approval of what had been done and, 16 December, repeated his approval in a letter to the British Ambassador at Paris. Russell, on the other hand, announced a policy of neutrality and asked for Palmerston's resignation. The joy of Victoria and Albert proved as premature as it was unbounded. Russell practically killed his Ministry by the dismissal of Palmerston; for the public believed with the latter that it was a "weak truckling to the hostile intrigues of the Orleanist family" and its supporters on the Continent. Indeed, unbearable as Palmerston's conduct had been, it is at least an open question

whether the demands of the Queen were not an encroachment on the recognized doctrine of ministerial responsibility. Within two months the deposed Minister succeeded in overthrowing the Government on the details of a militia bill.

The Aberdeen or Coalition Ministry (1852–1855). — After a brief Conservative administration under the Earl of Derby,[1] from February to December, 1852, when Disraeli came to the front as Leader of the House of Commons and, in view of the prosperous condition of the country, shrewdly abandoned the defunct issue of protection, a combination of Whigs and Peelites was patched together under the leadership of Lord Aberdeen. Although the Peelites commanded only thirty votes in the Commons, the ability and rank of their leaders secured for them a majority of the important places in the Cabinet. Chief among the Whigs were Palmerston, Home Secretary, and Russell, Foreign Secretary[2] and Leader of the House of Commons. Disraeli on the eve of his resignation had declared that: "England does not love coalitions." He proved a true prophet, but before the crisis came, the Aberdeen Ministry carried several good measures. Among them was the provision, in 1853, that, except in cases where the sentence was fourteen years and over, penal servitude should be substituted for transportation.[3] Also first steps were taken toward the opening of the civil service to public competition. More important, still, Gladstone, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, introduced the first of a series of marvelous budgets which established his reputation as perhaps the ablest financier of the century. Before many months, however, Great Britain was plunged into a European war which ruined all his calculations.

The Causes of the Crimean War. — The Crimean War, which broke out in the autumn, 1853, may be traced to three main causes: (1) the ambition of Louis Napoleon, who had assumed the title of Emperor in December, 1852, and who aimed to unite the French people in some great foreign enterprise; (2) the designs of Nicholas I, who wanted to extend the Russian protectorate over the Greek Christians in the Ottoman Empire, and to secure the outlet from the Black Sea to the Mediterranean, which was under Turkish control; and (3) the necessity felt by Great Britain to maintain the integrity of Turkey as a

[1] Formerly Lord Stanley.

[2] He was soon succeeded in this office by Lord Clarendon.

[3] The practice had begun in 1717 and came to be regarded as a great grievance by the American Colonies. In 1787 criminals were first shipped to Botany Bay in New South Wales; afterwards many other parts of Australia and other islands in the South Pacific were also employed as penal settlements. They too protested, and an inquiry into the system proved that it was bad from almost every point of view. It was finally done away with entirely.

means of checking the Russian advance toward India. The trouble began with a quarrel over the question as to whether the Greek or the Latin churches should control the Holy Places in Palestine. By a treaty made with the Porte in 1740 France had obtained for the Latin Church possession of all that were then in Turkish hands, but owing to subsequent negligence, the Greek Christians, who were assiduous in pilgrimages and in the maintenance of the sacred shrines, gradually usurped the protectorate and secured their position by special permits from the Ottoman Government. The religious revival of the nineteenth century, which followed the indifference and skepticism of the eighteenth, resulted in a desire on the part of many Frenchmen to recover what they had lost, and Louis Napoleon, in order to secure the support of this class, composed mostly of his political opponents, took up their cause. The Sultan, in his desire to satisfy France without estranging Russia, who stood back of the Greek Christians, proceeded to define the powers of the two Churches in a different way to each of the States involved. Such was the situation when Nicholas began to unveil his views about the future of Turkey. Already in June, 1844, he had, in a conversation with Aberdeen, referred to the Porte as a dying man, and suggested that, in case of a break-up, Great Britain and Russia should be in agreement as to what policy to pursue. Now in January, 1853, he renewed the subject with the British Ambassador at St. Petersburg; but received no encouragement whatsoever.

Great Britain Drawn into the War. — Thus far Great Britain had not become involved in the quarrel, and Aberdeen was anxious to preserve peace. Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, British representative to Constantinople and a stout opponent of Russian ambition, was chiefly responsible for dragging his country into the war as a principal. Prince Menshikov, Nicholas' agent in the Turkish negotiations, was a rough soldier, equally uncompromising, who not only required a satisfactory settlement of the question of the custody of the Holy Places, but demanded also that Russia should have a protectorate over all the Greek Christians in the Turkish dominions. Lord Stratford succeeded in separating the two questions, and the first, which was the original point at issue, was quickly and successfully adjusted. The second demand Menshikov finally presented in the form of an ultimatum. In a sense it was very natural and reasonable; the difficulty arose from the fact that since the Greek Christians numbered fourteen millions, or a majority of the Sultan's subjects, the Emperor as their protector might easily become the dominant factor in Ottoman affairs. For that reason Turkey, acting under the advice

of Lord Stratford, rejected the demand. Nicholas thereupon withdrew his Ambassador, and though he did not at once declare war, he sent his troops to occupy the Danubian Provinces. Aberdeen was still bent on conciliating Russia, though a powerful element in his Cabinet, headed by Russell and Palmerston, were in favor of forcing concessions, even by war if necessary. At length, 24 October, 1853, after attempts at mediation had proved unavailing, the Turkish commander on the Danube threatened the Russians with war unless they evacuated the Principalities within fifteen days. Receiving an unsatisfactory reply, the Turks crossed the river and fighting began. On 30 November, the Russian fleet from Sebastopol attacked and destroyed a Turkish fleet at Sinope. Although hostilities had already opened, this so-called "massacre of Sinope" aroused great indignation among the majority of Englishmen. Events moved rapidly. The French and British fleets entered the Black Sea. An alliance was signed between Great Britain and France, 12 March, 1854, followed by a declaration of war on the 28th, — and a generation ignorant of the horrors of war began, with rejoicing, a combat which a pacific Prime Minister had striven to avert.

The Opening of the Conflict, the Siege of Sebastopol. — At sea the Allies met with humiliating disappointments, for fleets dispatched both in 1854 and 1855 failed to capture their objectives. On the other hand, in August, 1854, Russia, owing to the effective resistance of the Turks and to the fact that Austria had moved a large force to the frontier, was obliged to withdraw her troops from the Principalities. It was an earlier refusal to do this which had brought on the war. Attention was soon focused on Sebastopol, the chief naval station and arsenal of the Russians, which was regarded as a dangerous menace to Turkey. The suggestion to attack it with a joint Anglo-French force may have come from Louis Napoleon, but it was enthusiastically welcomed by the British. Approved by the Cabinet, 28 June, 1854, the invading army which had been supporting the Turks on the northern frontier since May, did not land in Crimea till 14 September. Already weakened by cholera, they were sent against a strong fortress at the verge of the winter season without adequate supplies and with an insufficient siege train. Landing north of Sebastopol and proceeding southward, they succeeded in brushing aside a strong Russian force drawn up across their line of march; but instead of pressing directly on Sebastopol, they made the mistake of veering off toward the southeast. Thus the defenders had time to block the harbor with sunken men-of-war and to strengthen the town with new earthworks. The British established their base at Bala-

clava Bay, while the French took a position not far off. The siege opened 17 October; on the 25th, Menshikov was defeated in an attempt to secure control of the Bay,[1] and again, 5 November, the Russians were defeated in an attack on Mount Inkerman.

The Sufferings in the Crimea and the Fall of Aberdeen (1854–1855). — The British commander, Lord Raglan, decided to winter in the Crimea. Unhappily, a heavy storm, 14 November, wrecked the transports which were bringing medicine, clothing, and food for the men, with hay for the horses as well; the roads from the Bay to the camp were rendered impassable by snow and mud, the horses died from starvation and transportation became impossible. Owing to these adverse conditions and to the clumsy and short-sighted policy of the British Administration, the troops dragged through a winter of misery and suffering. It was no new thing for armies to be subjected to such privations; but, for the first time in history, the horrible conditions were promptly reported to a sympathizing and indignant public at home by Sir William Howard Russell of the *London Times*, the first of the special correspondents who have come to play such a part in modern warfare. Also, the conditions of the hospitals at Scutari, opposite Constantinople, were deplorable. There the dawn of happier times began with the arrival of Florence Nightingale (1820–1910) as a hospital nurse; she was soon put in full charge of affairs, and, although handicapped for some time by delays in transporting medicine and supplies, brought about notable reforms. In March, 1855, the establishment of a new Sanitary Commission did wonders; for the death rate between then and June fell from 31 to 2 per cent.[2] Meantime, on the opening of Parliament, in January, the Aberdeen Ministry was sharply attacked, and a motion was carried for the appointment of a committee: "to inquire into the condition of our army before Sebastopol, and into the conduct of those departments of the Government whose duty it has been to minister to the wants of that army." This led first to the retirement of Russell, and, very shortly, to that of the whole Cabinet.

The Advent of Palmerston as Prime Minister (February, 1855), and the Fall of Sebastopol (October, 1855). — After trying all other possibilities in vain, the Queen was at length obliged to turn to her old enemy Palmerston. While the findings of the Commission of Inquiry proved to be a very guarded indictment against the late

[1] The Battle of Balaclava has been immortalized in Tennyson's "Charge of the Light Brigade."

[2] Another notable later advance was the foundation of the Red Cross Society to carry out the ideals of the Geneva Convention of 1864.

Administration, it was decided that the existing system was too cumbersome: in consequence, the civil and military administration for the conduct of war was concentrated in the Secretary for War[1] and the Commander-in-Chief respectively. In January, the Franco-British alliance was strengthened by the adhesion of Piedmont, while the vigor of the Russian resistance was greatly weakened by the death of Nicholas I, 2 March, 1855. Operations before Sebastopol were pushed with energy, but for a time with no great success. The British, in an attack on the fortress known as the Redan, were thrown back, June, 1855. After investing Sebastopol all summer, the Allies made a supreme effort 8 September; in an assault that was preceded by a three days' cannonade the British captured the Redan only to lose it again, but the French were successful in securing the Malakoff Tower which commanded all the surrounding works. Realizing that further resistance was hopeless, the Russian commander destroyed the remaining fortifications and retreated by a bridge which he had constructed across the harbor. Sebastopol had held out for nearly a year. In spite of the draining of their resources and the loss of their chief arsenal, the Russians were still able to maintain armies in the field, while they even gained a slight compensating advantage when the fortress of Kars in Asia Minor surrendered to their arms after a sustained and heroic defense. Moreover, Napoleon III, realizing that his subjects were regarding with growing disfavor a war waged in alliance with the British, lent a willing ear to Austria, who was anxious to arrange terms of peace. Although the British public were anxious to continue fighting in the hope of gaining a signal victory that would wipe out the memory of the bungling and reverses of their troops, the Government agreed to participate in a peace congress which met at Paris in February, 1856.

The Peace of Paris (30 March, 1856). — Lord Clarendon, Great Britain's leading representative, was disgusted with Napoleon's pliant attitude; nevertheless he struggled hard, and, backed by Austria, secured better terms for the Allies than Napoleon would have stood out for. On 30 March, 1856, the Treaty was signed by France, Russia, Great Britain, Turkey, Piedmont, Austria, and Prussia, the latter power having been admitted to the Conference after it was already under way. Among the chief terms were: (1) Russia and Turkey agreed to a mutual restoration of territories. (2) The independence and integrity of Turkey was guaranteed, together with her recognized place among European powers. (3) A charter recently

[1] At this time separated from the Colonial Office with which it had been combined since 1801.

issued by the Sultan providing for the protection of his Christian subjects, with the proviso that European nations should not interfere, was confirmed. (4) The Black Sea and the Dardanelles were neutralized and closed to ships of war, while both Russia and Turkey were prohibited from maintaining arsenals along the coast. The Conference also subscribed to the "Declaration of Paris" — an epoch in the progress of international law, — which provided that: (1) Privateering should be abolished; (2) a neutral flag should cover an enemy's goods except contraband of war; (3) neutral goods, except contraband of war, even under an enemy's flag, should be exempt from capture; (4) blockades to be binding must be effective.[1] As to the Peace itself there was, according to one of the French negotiators, "nothing to show which was the conqueror and which the conquered." Many have asserted, too, that Great Britain got very little for the sacrifices of lives and money which her intervention involved, but the designs of Russians on the integrity of Turkey were checked for years to come; moreover various Balkan States — Rumania, Serbia, Montenegro, and Bulgaria — which subsequently wrested their independence from the effete Ottoman Empire, might, had Russia been allowed to go on unobstructed, have been absorbed as subjects of the Tsar.

A Troubled Situation. — The Peace of Paris was followed by difficulties with the United States over the enlistment of American citizens in the British army during the Crimean War, though timely concessions prevented a rupture. Also, Great Britain had to face a Persian advance against Afghanistan, a movement regarded as a part of Russian intrigue — with India as the ultimate goal — which was successfully repulsed in the year 1857, while a war with China, beginning in the same year, was not concluded till 1860, largely owing to mutiny in India, which threatened for a time the very existence of the British Indian Empire.

The Fall of Palmerston (February, 1858). — Early in February, 1858, in the midst of these complications, Palmerston was overthrown, strangely enough on the ground of truckling to the demands of a foreign Power. On 14 January a band of conspirators led by an Italian, Orsini, had attempted to assassinate the French Emperor and Empress in Paris, and while the intended victims escaped, ten persons were killed and one hundred fifty wounded by the bombs thrown at the Imperial carriage. Orsini was tried and put to death. In the course of the investigation it came out that the plot had been

[1] While the United States did not come into this agreement, refusing to abolish privateering unless all private property other than contraband of war should be free from capture, she subsequently came to adopt it in practice.

hatched in London and that the bombs had been manufactured in Birmingham. The indignation of the French army officers passed all bounds; indeed they even demanded to be led against the country which they were pleased to term a "den of assassins." The French Minister of Foreign Affairs showed wise restraint, but went so far as to state that France had a right to expect "from an ally" some effectual guarantee against the repetition of such outrages. When Palmerston, in order to prevent a possible rupture, framed a Conspiracies to Murder Bill which made the crime—hitherto a misdemeanor—a felony punishable with penal servitude for life, his action created a furious outcry, his bill was defeated and he resigned.

The Second Derby Ministry and Jewish Relief (1858). — Lord Derby came in for another brief Ministry from February, 1858, to June, 1859. The French difficulty was speedily smoothed over by skillful diplomacy on both sides, though popular rancor did not subside so readily. With only a minority in the Commons, Derby's greatest achievement was to secure a measure of justice for the Jews who had been excluded from Parliament by the clause in the repeal of the Test Act (1828), requiring them to take an oath on the true faith of a Christian — a restriction against which they had protested for years. In 1858, the Lords, after they had rejected a bill which Russell had carried through the Commons to do away with the disabling oath, agreed to a compromise allowing each House to frame its own test. Thereupon, the Commons drew up an oath which Jews could take and perpetuated it by a standing order. Eight years later, in 1866, a Statute was passed that made it possible for them to sit in either House. The year 1858 was also notable for the abolition of the property qualification of members of the Commons, a restriction which had long been evaded by transparent fictions.

The Franco-Austrian War (1859), and the Achievement of Italian Unity (1861–1870). — The Derby Ministry was defeated in June, 1859, on account of its alleged friendliness to Austria in a war which had just arisen over the situation in northern Italy. The men condemned in the Orsini conspiracy had begged Napoleon III to undertake the task of liberating Italy from Austrian control. Either because they had succeeded in arousing ideals which had long slumbered in his bosom, or because he feared that a refusal might lead to new attempts upon his life, he set to work. Cavour, the far-sighted and intrepid statesman, who years before had begun to shape plans to secure Italian independence and unity, who had brought Piedmont into the Crimean war, and who had accordingly been allowed to raise the Italian question at the recent Congress of Paris, was just the

man to lead him along the road on which he had once started. On the invitation of Napoleon, the two held a momentous interview in which, much beyond Cavour's hopes, the French Emperor agreed to assist the Kingdom of Sardinia in the expulsion of Austria from Lombardy and Venetia if a just cause for war could be found; Cavour, in his turn, promising to hand over Savoy and Nice to France. In a manner worthy of his famous uncle, the Emperor very abruptly, at his New Year's reception in 1859, expressed his regret to the Austrian Ambassador that the relations between the two countries were not so good as they had once been. Austria, foreseeing the approach of a crisis, sent an ultimatum to Sardinia, ordering her to disarm, and meeting with a refusal, the war began. Queen Victoria and the Derby Ministry, who favored the Austrians, made a vain attempt to mediate. When the time came to take a decisive step, Napoleon hesitated; but finding events had gone beyond his control, he finally led a French army in person to the aid of the Sardinian King, Victor Emmanuel.[1] In June the Austrians were successively defeated in two decisive battles, and 11 July, Francis Joseph, their Emperor, accepted the preliminaries of a peace, concluded in November, by which he ceded Lombardy to Napoleon III, who was to hand it over to Victor Emmanuel. Tuscany, Modena, and the other States who had expelled their absolutist rulers were to reinstate them; but, since their people willed otherwise, they were united to the Sardinian Monarchy. During the spring and summer of 1860 Garibaldi in a dashing campaign secured Sicily and Naples. With the help of the royal Sardinian army other conquests followed, and, 17 March, 1861, Victor Emmanuel was crowned King of a united Italy, which included the whole of the peninsula, except Venice and Rome — incorporated in 1866 and 1870 respectively.

The Second Palmerston Ministry (June, 1859). — Meantime, at the very opening of the Franco-Austrian War, Palmerston, whose sympathies were altogether with the Italians, had again come to power. So far as Home politics were concerned, he was far from being a Liberal. Many vital measures of reform had to await his death before they were taken up by the Government; nevertheless, while the chief interest of his Ministry centers in foreign politics, the period was not absolutely barren of progress in domestic affairs, though such steps in advance were usually carried in spite of him rather than by his aid. Indeed, the whole financial policy of Gladstone, once more Chancellor of the Exchequer, was far more liberal than that of his chief. He proposed, in his budget of 1860, to reduce the number of articles on the tariff from 419 to 48, and, what aroused the stoutest opposition, to repeal

[1] The House of Savoy ruled both Piedmont and Sardinia.

the paper duty. This meant cheaper newspapers, and was in line with the policy by which the stamp duties had been abolished in 1855. Palmerston, who shared in the view that the result would be the spread of popular and social discontent, stood out against the measure in the Cabinet, after which he wrote the Queen that if the House of Lords should be encouraged by his attitude to assert itself, it would "perform a good public service." Never, since the beginning of Cabinets, had there been such a breach of the principle of Ministerial solidarity, and all that can be said for the Prime Minister is that he made no attempt to conceal his action. The Lords rejected the bill in which the proposed repeal was embodied. While it was well recognized that they could not amend a money bill,[1] their right of rejection, though not often exercised, could not be questioned. Gladstone and the Commons carried their point, in 1861, by making the Paper Duty Repeal Bill a part of the budget. Confronted with the two possibilities of passing or rejecting all the appropriations for the year, the Lords chose the former.

The Outbreak of Civil War in the United States (1861). — The Civil War in the United States, which broke out in the spring of 1861, brought Great Britain face to face with serious problems, both foreign and domestic. There was a twofold issue involved, the question of the extension of slavery and that of secession, a situation which contributed to confuse the attitude of British public sentiment. While the nation as a whole was opposed to the institution of slavery, the general tendency was to minimize that issue and to look for the chief cause of the war in the attempt of the North to hold the South in the Union against her will. Differences of opinion in England were based on social rather than on party lines. The upper classes supported the landowning gentry of the South as against the merchants, traders, and small farmers of the North. Furthermore, many of them argued that the slaves were kindly treated, and that there were not enough abuses in the system to justify interference with vested property interests and "sovereign rights of States." The middle and lower classes in the Midlands stood by the North, which was much to their credit, since the mills which furnished, directly or indirectly, the livelihood of vast numbers of them, depended on the cotton supplies of the Southern States. The leading Ministers of the Liberal party, then in power, Palmerston, Russell, and Gladstone, were at one with the Conservative aristocracy as against those who furnished their main constituency. Gladstone went so far as to declare in a public speech: Jefferson Davis "had made an army, had made a navy, and, what is

[1] See above p. 370.

more, had made a nation." Yet in spite of its manifest sympathies, the Government decided to assume a position of strict neutrality. On 14 May, 1861, a proclamation to that effect was issued. Englishmen were prohibited from enlisting, from supplying privateers, from lending any other form of aid to either party. Great Britain thus went to the point of recognizing the South as a belligerent, though she never acknowledged the independence of the Confederacy. Relations, however, were strained during the whole period of the war. The South was aggrieved that the British would not espouse their cause more actively, while the North resented the unfriendly attitude of the Government and the fact that the policy of neutrality was not better enforced.

The Trent Affair (1861). — Almost at the start, an unfortunate incident brought Great Britain and the United States to the brink of war. In November, 1861, Mason and Slidell, two commissioners of the Confederacy, embarked at Havana in the British mail steamer *Trent* to seek aid from Great Britain and France. The vessel was boarded on the high seas by Captain Wilkes, of the United States ship *San Jacinto*, and Mason and Slidell were taken off as prisoners.[1] The news aroused a storm of indignation in England, while Palmerston and Russell started to handle the question in their customary precipitate and arrogant manner. Fortunately, the Queen, acting under the sage advice of the Prince Consort, was able to find a way out of the difficulty. In place of the apology at first demanded, the British Government expressed itself satisfied with the release of the prisoners and the assurance that Captain Wilkes had acted without instructions. This was the last important work of Prince Albert, who died of typhoid fever, 14 December. It was a blow from which Victoria never recovered; while she devoted herself with increasing conscientiousness to business of state, she practically withdrew from all social activities for twenty years.

Blockade Runners and Privateers. — While the sealing up of the Southern ports crippled the cotton industry in Lancashire to an alarming extent, the operatives did not waver in their allegiance to the Unionist cause, and the Government insisted in recognizing the efficacy of the blockade. Nevertheless, British speculators made enormous profits from blockade running. Much as the United States resented this, its chief grievance was the active share which British ship-builders took in fitting out privateers for the Confederacy to

[1] American opposition to such peremptory exercise of the right of search on the part of the British had been one of the causes of the War of 1812. The only proper procedure would have been to send the *Trent* to port for trial.

prey on neutral commerce. Of the seven cruisers which were really formidable, five were British built. The *Alabama* was the most notorious and destructive: she was constructed at Liverpool, and, although the attention of the British Government was repeatedly called to the purpose for which she was designed, no steps were taken to detain her until it was too late, and for two years she continued her dreaded course until she was sunk 19 June, 1864.

The Cotton Famine in Great Britain. — The final surrender of the Confederacy in April, 1865, put an end to a situation which was growing steadily more embarrassing for Great Britain. Unhappily, the cotton shortage was accentuated by the greed of some of the Lancashire owners who sold their reserve stocks for high prices abroad. The distress became so acute that the Government had to devise special measures of poor relief. Great assistance was rendered by voluntary subscriptions of food, clothing and money, to which the Colonies generously contributed. Those who could get any sort of work proudly refused charity, while many who had savings bank accounts exhausted them before they would seek aid. Conditions were at their worst during the autumn and winter of 1862; then they began to improve, owing to the increasing supply of cotton from the East, to the absorption of the unemployed in other industries, and to emigration.

The Mexican Schemes of Napoleon III. — Far more serious to the United States than the unfriendly attitude of Great Britain were the designs of Napoleon III. In 1862 he suggested to Russell that the British combine with Russia and France in a joint attempt at mediation, a proposal which the Foreign Minister rejected forthwith. Then he had another really wild scheme from which Great Britain also held aloof. In the autumn of 1860 she had joined with France and Spain in sending an expedition to Mexico, also plunged in civil war. When the original object — to protect European subjects and to enforce payment on loans advanced to the Mexicans — was attained, Great Britain and Spain withdrew their forces, refusing to support Napoleon in a vast plan, which he unfolded, of occupying the Mexican capital and setting up a new Empire in the Latin-American world.[1]

Schleswig-Holstein Question (1863–1864). — The temperate counsels of the Prince Consort were missed sorely enough in the troubled Anglo-American relations from 1861 to 1865, but even more in the complicated

[1] In May, 1862, he succeeded in inducing Maximilian, brother of Francis Joseph of Austria, to accept the Imperial title. After considerable fighting, the Mexicans again restored a stable republic, and the unfortunate Maximilian was court-martialed and shot, 20 June, 1867.

Schleswig-Holstein question in which Great Britain became involved in 1863. Indeed, as Palmerston once remarked, Prince Albert was one of the three men who had ever understood it, another was a Danish statesman who had lost his mind, and he himself, who was the third, had forgotten it. Certainly it was a question complicated enough for anyone to lose his mind over if he did not forget it. In the fifteenth century the Kingdom of Denmark and the Duchies of Schleswig and Holstein, which lie at the base of the Danish peninsula, came under one ruler, on condition that the Duchies should never be incorporated. Moreover, the line of succession was different; the Danish allowed transmission through females, while, in the Duchies, the Salic law prevailed. In 1848 Frederick VII came to the throne. Frederick, who was the last of his immediate line, chose as his successor a remote connection — Prince Christian of Glücksburg. The Duke of Augustenburg, a claimant to the succession in Schleswig-Holstein, was bought off, in 1852, for a substantial sum of money. Holstein was preponderatingly German and belonged to the German Confederation, while in Schleswig there was a strong Danish element attached to Denmark. Contrary to the ancient stipulation and contrary to assurances which he had given, a Danish Parliament, in the last year of Frederick's reign, adopted a new Constitution incorporating Schleswig into his Kingdom, and granting, at the same time, autonomy to Holstein. On his death in 1863 the question was brought to an issue. Under the energetic direction of Bismarck, who had recently become President of the Prussian Ministry and who was determined to weld Germany together by a policy of "blood and iron," Prussia entered into an agreement with Austria to drive the Danes out of these Duchies and to hold them jointly. As it subsequently developed, his two aims were to secure both Schleswig and Holstein — which separated the main part of Prussia from her territories along the Rhine[1] — and to pick a quarrel with Austria, the chief obstacle to Prussia's leadership in German unification. On the other hand, the smaller German States, supported by a liberal minority in Prussia, aimed to make the Duchies an independent member of the German Confederation; for they feared the growing power of Prussia. So they backed the Duke of Augustenburg, who, regardless of the fact that he had been bought off, revived his claim for his son. Bismarck, however, bore all before him. Backed by Austria he sent an ultimatum to Christian IX demanding that the recent Constitution be reversed within forty-eight hours, a condition manifestly impossible, since the late Parlia-

[1] Moreover, he wished to acquire Kiel, now the chief naval station in the Baltic and the eastern terminal of the Kiel canal, built in 1895.

ment had been dissolved and a new one had not been elected. When the demand was not complied with, Prussia and Austria proceeded to make war.

Aside from the possible effect on the European balance of power, the British were interested on dynastic grounds. Alexandra, the daughter of Christian IX, had just married the Prince of Wales, while Victoria, the Queen's eldest daughter, had, in 1858, become the wife of Frederick, heir to the throne of Prussia. The sympathies of the British Queen were with the Germans as against the Danes, and with the Prussians as against the Augustenburg party; not only did she feel that Great Britain was bound by the treaty of 1852 in which the Augustenburg claim had been annulled, but she wanted to see Prussia grow strong in Germany. Her Cabinet and her people, on the contrary, were strong for the Danes. This was due partly to the popularity of Princess Alexandra and partly to the feeling that Denmark was a weak State oppressed by a strong and bullying combination. Palmerston and Russell talked loudly of intervention in the Danish behalf. While Queen Victoria took no pains to conceal her strong German sympathies, she strove, though in vain, to avert a war. After the Danes had been defeated by the joint forces of the Prussians and Austrians, she arranged, in 1864, a Conference at London, which, however, came to nothing. When Palmerston and Russell continued to talk of intervention in behalf of the Danes, she insisted upon neutrality, and even threatened to dissolve Parliament and appeal to the people if the Ministers continued their belligerent course. She had her way, and Great Britain kept her hands off when Prussia and Austria, after the failure of the Conference, proceeded to secure their hold on the Duchies. Palmerson had led on the Danes in their futile resistance by holding out hopes which he could not realize, and he and the Foreign Secretary had made themselves ridiculous in Europe by what Derby very effectively termed their policy of "meddle and muddle." Yet it was not their fault that they had to back down. It was due partly to the Queen and partly to the French Emperor on whose support they had counted. Napoleon III, however, owing to the fact that Great Britain had refused to give him anything more than moral support, had recently been forced to submit to a contemptuous rebuff from the Russians when he had ventured to remonstrate with them for their treatment of the Poles, who had been driven to rebellion in January, 1863. Consequently, he declined to take any decided step unless the British Government bound itself to go to war if necessary.

The Death of Palmerston and the End of an Epoch (1865). — The death of Palmerston, 18 October, 1865, when he was within two days

of eighty-one, ended an epoch. In domestic politics he was an old-fashioned Whig who with his tremendous prestige succeeded, so long as he lived, in blocking grave problems of social and political reform that were pressing for solution. He would hear of no further extension of the franchise, and his attitude toward the suffering peasantry in Ireland may be summed up in his famous phrase: "Tenant right is landlord's wrong." Conservative as he was in Home politics he was hated by European Governments as a "patron of revolution" and a "disturber of the relations between subjects and their sovereigns." In his handling of foreign questions he had often embarrassed the Queen, he had made many blunders, and he was too prone to consider more the "honor of Great Britain than the merits of the question involved," his political integrity was not always beyond reproach, he was wanting in the qualities of constructive statesmanship, he was irrepressible, overbearing, and flippant. Nevertheless, he was the friend of national liberal aspiration, he was courageous, industrious, witty and good-natured, and very popular because he was the embodiment of ideals which the average Englishman could understand. The country, however, was now ready for new men and new measures.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

Narrative. Marriott; Bright, IV; Maxwell, II; Martineau (to 1846); *Cambridge Modern History*, X, XI; Walpole, *The History of Twenty-five Years* (1904), I, and *England*, IV–VI, to 1856. J. McCarthy, *History of Our Own Times* (vols. I–III, 1880) is a "popular" work and a very readable account. Herbert Paul, *History of Modern England* (5 vols., 1904–6) I, II, journalistic and partisan, Liberal standpoint.

Biography. S. Lee, *Queen Victoria* (1902), an excellent brief sketch. Sir T. Martin, *Life of the Prince Consort* (5 vols., 1875–1880). J. Morley, *The Life of W. E. Gladstone* (3 vols., 1903), the standard life of Gladstone. Monypenny and Buckle, *Life of Disraeli* (vols. I and II, go to 1846), the most complete and best biography. T. P. O'Connor, *Lord Beaconsfield* (6th ed., 1884), hostile estimate. T. E. Kebble, *Lord Beaconsfield and other Tory Memoirs* (1907). G. B. Hill, *Life of Rowland Hill* (2 vols., 1880). J. Morley, *Richard Cobden* (2 vols., 1881). J. A. Hobson, *Richard Cobden, the International Man* (1919), a sketch emphasizing Cobden's pacifist activities. G. M. Trevelyan, *John Bright* (1913). W. M. Torrens, *Memoirs of Lord Melbourne* (2 vols., 1878). G. Saintsbury, *Life of the Earl of Derby* (1892). S. J. Reid, *Life of Lord John Russell* (1886). J. B. Atlay, *Victorian Chancellors* (2 vols., 1908). For Russell, Peel, and Palmerston, see above, chs. XLVIII–L.

Special Works. T. Carlyle, *Chartism* (1839). R. G. Gammage, *History of Chartism* (1854, revised in expanded form, 1894). W. Lovett and J.

Collins, *Chartism* (1840). P. W. Slosson, *The Decline of the Chartist Movement in England* (1916); F. F. Rosenblatt, *The Chartist Movement in its Social and Economic Aspects* (pt. I, 1916); and H. W. Falkner, *Chartism and the Churches* (1916); three useful studies. Mark Hovell, *The Chartist Movement* (1918); excellent. B. Holland, *The Fall of Protection, 1840–1850* (1913), traces effect on Empire, Protectionist in sympathy. The authority on the Crimean War is A. W. Kinglake, *The Invasion of the Crimea* (8 vols., 1863–1887). M. Bernard, *A Historical Account of the Neutrality of Great Britain during the American Civil War* (1870).

Contemporary. *The Greville Memoirs*. B. Disraeli, *Bentinck, a Political Biography* (1852). *Papers of Lord Melbourne* (ed. L. C. Sanders, 1889). Baron Stockmar, *Memoirs* (tr. M. Müller, 2 vols., 1872). Queen Victoria, *Letters* (eds. A. C. Benson and Viscount Esher, 3 vols., 1907), to 1861; throw a flood of light on early Victorian statesmen and politics. Esher, *The Girlhood of Queen Victoria, 1836–40* (1912), selections from her diary, abbreviated in *The Training of a Sovereign* (1914). John, Earl Russell, *Recollections and Suggestions* (1875).

Selections from the sources. Adams and Stephens, nos. 266–267. Robertson, pt. II, nos. XXVII–XXVIII, app. p. 438.

CHAPTER LIII

A NEW ERA IN DEMOCRACY. THE POLITICAL RIVALRY OF GLADSTONE AND DISRAELI (1865–1880)

The Second Russell Ministry (1865–1866) and the State of the Franchise. — While the death of Palmerston removed the chief obstacle to progress in domestic legislation, some years were yet to elapse before either of the two men, Gladstone and Disraeli, who were to dominate the political situation for the next generation, came to head a Cabinet; for Lord John Russell (created Earl Russell in 1861) succeeded Palmerston, with whom, except for occasional intervals of rivalry, he had worked for more than thirty years. The Russell Administration was confronted with many acute problems — on the Continent a war involving tremendous issues, at Home parliamentary reform, again a burning question. Since the passage of the celebrated Act of 1832, numerous Reform bills had been introduced; but none of them had even succeeded in passing the Commons. The right of voting was still greatly restricted and the representation unevenly distributed. In 1865, out of 5,300,000 adult males, there were only 900,000 voters. Thus only one man in six was entitled to vote and the working classes were practically excluded. Many anomalies in the representation, left untouched in 1832, had been much accentuated by the amazing growth of the industrial population during the past thirty-five years. The borough of Totnes with 4000 inhabitants returned as many members as Liverpool with a population of 443,000, and the thinly populated county of Cornwall had a larger representation than the populous Middlesex.

The Awakening of Democracy. Russell's Reform Bill of 1866 and Its Defeat. — While the majority of both Houses was still opposed to change and the public seemed indifferent, such inequalities could not go on forever. Moreover, the country was on the eve of a great democratic awakening. The people were going to insist more and more that it was the proper function of the State to educate them, to provide for the public health, and to regulate their relations with their employers. Yet if the powers of the Government were to be thus en-

larged, it followed that those whose interests were at stake should have a larger voice in public affairs. This progress toward democracy was greatly stimulated by the outcome of the American Civil War. The victory of the North was a triumph for democracy over an aristocratic oligarchy. It added greatly to the prestige of Midland operatives that they had been wiser than the Conservative upper classes in foreseeing the outcome, while the patience with which they had suffered for their principles gained for them not only sympathy but great respect throughout the country. Thus strength was given to an argument which began to be advanced that they could not be denied the vote which was to be conceded to the negroes in the United States. Nevertheless, the bill which Russell introduced in 1866 was defeated, largely owing to a revolt of a section of the Liberal party who came to be known as the "Adullamites," from John Bright's comparison of them to Saul's discontented subjects who took refuge with David in the cave of Adullam. The victory of the Opposition drove Russell from office in June.[1] Curiously enough, it was now the fate of the Conservatives to carry a bill so radical as virtually to transfer the balance of power from the middle classes to the workingman.

The Third Derby Ministry (June, 1866–February, 1868). The Rousing of the People. — For the third time, Lord Derby became Prime Minister with the support of only a minority of the House of Commons. During the interval between the resignation of Russell and the meeting of Parliament in February of 1867, a sentiment for reform developed among the working classes as irresistible as it was sudden. The rejection of Russell's bill had furnished the impulse, while the discontent aroused by a financial crisis, together with stirring speeches by Bright and Gladstone, did the rest. On 23 July, after the authorities had forbidden a meeting in Hyde Park and closed the gates, the mob tore up the iron railings and streamed in through the breach. This demonstration made a profound impression. Even more significant, perhaps, were the organizations which were formed to advance the cause, the street processions, the crowded meetings, and the eloquent arguments of the chief speakers. Disraeli, once more leader of the House of Commons, was just the man to take advantage of the situation, to do exactly what he had denounced Peel for doing twenty years before, to run away with the clothes of the Whigs when he had caught them bathing.

[1] Though he lived till 1878, his public life came practically to an end in 1866. While he had made many blunders during his long career, nevertheless, he had devoted practically his whole life to the public service, and was ever a stanch advocate of measures making for progress and the good of the people.

The Reform Bill of 1867. — Declaring that his aim was to "work for the public good, instead of bringing forward mock measures to be defeated by the spirit of the party," Disraeli at first sought to secure the support of both Liberals and Conservatives to a series of resolutions on the subject. They contained a number of commonplaces; but their main purport was to take away with one hand what they gave with the other by checking the concessions made to the laboring classes with a complicated system of "fancy franchises" [1] and dual voting. These resolutions aroused the combined opposition of both factions of the Liberal party and were withdrawn. Eventually all the securities designed to comfort the Tories, such as "fancy franchises" and dual voting,[2] had to be thrown overboard. The qualifications for voting, as finally fixed in the bill of 1867, were: in boroughs all householders who paid the poor rates [3] and all lodgers of one year's residence whose annual rent was £10; in the counties, all owners of land of £5 annual value and all occupying tenants whose rental was £12. With regard to redistribution of seats, certain readjustments were made without altering the size of the House of Commons, among others the right of sending two members was taken from all boroughs of less than 10,000 inhabitants, while four large towns — Manchester, Birmingham, Liverpool and Leeds — were given a third member each. Scotland gained a few seats; but the Irish membership was left unchanged.

The Significance of the Act of 1867. — A long step had been taken in the direction of democracy. Derby and Disraeli had carried through a much needed measure of reform and they had "dished the Whigs"; but they had done it by coolly violating their pledges and sacrificing the principles of the Conservatives who had put them in office. It should be said, however, that it was in line with Disraeli's political philosophy to combine the nobility and the workingman against the great middle class. While to Derby the momentous experiment was "a leap in the dark," he declared boldly that he was "educating his

[1] A name contemptuously imposed by John Bright on Disraeli's device for enabling a man who was a university graduate, a member of a learned profession, or who possessed a certain amount of personal property, to cast a vote in addition to the one to which he was entitled as a householder.

[2] This did not affect a form of plural voting already existing, whereby a man can vote in more than one place, provided that he possesses the requisite borough and county qualifications.

[3] Certain small householders, instead of paying the public rates directly, "compounded" with the landlords, or included their share in their rents, and were accordingly known as "compound householders." This compounding system was abolished, and even small householders were assessed directly. Compounding was restored, however, in 1869.

party." This drew from one of his opponents the grim comment: "we must now educate our masters," and the gloomy prophecy that: "the bag which holds the winds will be untied, and we shall be surrounded by a perpetual whirl of change, alteration, innovation, and revolution." Yet the results were far from cataclysmic; for although a new era of progressive legislation followed, the newly enfranchised class proved far from revolutionary in its demands.

The Austro-Prussian War (1866). — While England was involved in the struggle over the extension of the franchise, Prussia, having succeeded in forcing a breach with the Austrians over the administration of Holstein, had overwhelmed them in a seven weeks' war, which broke out in June, 1866, and by the Peace of Prague, 23 August, realized two great ambitions which had guided her policy for years. One was the organization of the North German Confederation under Prussian presidency; the other was the rounding out of her dominions and the welding together of her scattered territories by the incorporation of Schleswig-Holstein, Hanover, and various other States. By the Treaty of Vienna, 3 October, the Austrians were forced to cede Venice to Victor Emmanuel — whom Bismarck had attached to the Prussian side — and to recognize the Kingdom of Italy. Queen Victoria had sought to avert the conflict by mediation; but her offers had been brusquely repulsed by Bismarck. The British Government was in no position to insist; for the policy of Palmerston had left the country in a position of isolation, estranged from the United States, from Russia, and from France. Thenceforth, for many years, Great Britain aimed, so far as circumstances would permit, to hold aloof from European complications, to maintain a policy of strictest neutrality, and to devote her attention to problems of Empire.

Disraeli, the Man and his Work. — In February, 1868, Lord Derby resigned on account of failing health, and was succeeded by Disraeli, who was now sixty-four years of age. For thirty years he had been a member of the House of Commons, and for half that period had been the recognized leader of his party, posing all the while as a man of fashion and at intervals publishing novels. Starting with a theory of the Constitution which should emphasize the power of the Monarchy and the masses as against the Whig commercial aristocracy, he for a time led a band of youthful followers known as the Young England party; but ended as an Imperialist of the most pronounced type. He first established his position by his brilliant and merciless onslaughts on Peel at the time of the Corn Law agitation. While he showed no unusual capacity as a routine administrator, he proved unsurpassed as a party leader, formidable and courageous, resourceful, audacious, and

imaginative. He was a remarkable judge of men, and succeeded in gaining the favor and confidence of the Queen to a higher degree than perhaps any statesman of the reign. This was due to his enthusiasm for the monarchical principle of government, to his growing faith in the Imperial destiny of England, and above all to his courtesy and considerateness and his power of flattery. As he himself boasted, "Gladstone treats the Queen like a public department, I treat her like a woman." One looks in vain for any great measures of progressive legislation which he initiated, but the rescue of the Tory party from the decline which followed the Peelite schism and the popularization of the modern Imperialistic idea are peculiarly his work.

Gladstone, His Character and Policy. — The Opposition leader, Gladstone (1809–1898), though five years younger than Disraeli, had already been in Parliament five years longer. The son of a rich Liverpool merchant of Scotch birth, he had the "audacious shrewdness of Lancashire married to the polished grace of Oxford." His intellectual curiosity, his energy and versatility were prodigious. Beginning as a Tory, he seceded with the Peelites and ended his career as a Liberal. Although his abilities were manifest much earlier, his Budget of 1853 first established his reputation as a financier entitled to rank with Walpole, Pitt, and Peel. His measures of constructive statesmanship cannot be even touched upon except by outlining the last half century of English history. Great as was his superiority to Disraeli in domestic legislation, his rival far outshone him as a Foreign Minister. Gladstone always raised his voice in behalf of oppressed nationalities, but he gave no continuous attention to external concerns, and, during his Administrations, it was generally felt that England suffered abroad both in dignity and power because of vacillating and dilatory methods. His success as a legislator and administrator was enhanced by his fascinating power of expounding the measures which he framed. He was, to be sure, over-copious and subtle, and surpassed by many in the finest gifts of literary grace; but thanks to his telling phrases, his magical, sonorous voice, his flashing eye, his wondrous vitality and earnestness, no orator of his generation, except John Bright, was his superior. Gladstone was never congenial to the Queen. His secession from the Peelites toward democratic liberalism offended her, and his reforming zeal, with its ruthless disregard of established institutions and vested interests, excited her apprehension. He never spared her, as for example when he sent her twelve closely filled pages on the complicated details of a single bill. Then the ease with which he changed his mind, and "oiled the joints" of his sudden transitions with words, bewildered her, as it did many another. Moreover, while naturally

considerate, he came, because of his tremendous moral enthusiasm, to regard himself as a chosen vessel and impressed his opponents and many of his followers as dictatorial. While Disraeli achieved little in the way of tangible reform and recreated the Conservatives, Gladstone accomplished much and broke up the Liberal party.

Gladstone's First Ministry (1868–1874). — Disraeli held his first Premiership less than a year. When a general election, held in the autumn of 1868, resulted in a complete Liberal victory at the polls, he took the wise but novel step of resigning without waiting to face the new Parliament, and, 4 December, Gladstone was intrusted with the task of forming the first of his four Ministries. For the first time in years there were two united parties confronting one another, each led by a dominant personality. There were pressing problems to be dealt with — abolition of privilege, reduction of expenditure, readjustment of taxation, constructive social measures and the perennial Irish question. Valiantly meeting these problems, the first Gladstone Administration was fruitful, to an unusual degree, in significant legislation.

The Fenian Movement (1858–1865). — The Irish problem claimed the first attention; for disturbances which Disraeli once tersely attributed to "a starving people, absentee landlords, and an alien Church" had broken out in a new and acute form. The disturbances were due to the activity of the Fenians.[1] Early in the fifties, Phoenix clubs had begun to spring up in Dublin in which young men enrolled for the purpose of achieving Irish independence; but little was accomplished till after the foundation of the Fenian Brotherhood in New York in 1858. The organization spread rapidly through the United States, where the immigrants who, since the potato famine, had flocked across the ocean in steadily growing numbers, had accumulated money and political training which made them more capable than their countrymen at home of initiating a serious rebellion. Fenianism had no design of bettering agrarian conditions, it had no great hold on the peasantry, and it was frowned upon by the Roman Catholic priesthood. Its aim was to throw off the British rule by intimidation and force. The movement received a great impetus from the American Civil War, which furnished a military training for thousands of Irishmen and aroused their martial spirit, while the ill-feeling which developed between Great Britain and the United States led them to count on the alliance of the Americans. Many of the Irish-Americans began to

[1] The name "Fenians" is derived from an old Irish word meaning "champions of Ireland," and was originally applied to certain tribes who served as the militia of the ancient Kings of Erin.

make their way home, to extend their organization and to stir up disaffection in England and Ireland.

The Fenian Plots and their Suppression (1865–1867). — The outspokenness of the conspirators and the reports of spies stirred the Government to action. As the result of treachery, O'Donovan Rossa, the proprietor of the *Irish People*, was taken prisoner, 15 September, 1865, and various supplies of arms were disclosed and captured. One reverse after another followed. On 31 May, 1866, an attempted Fenian invasion of Canada failed, largely on account of the determined attitude of the United States. A general rising, projected in Ireland in March, 1867, proved abortive. During the year 1867 England witnessed at least three disquieting manifestations of Fenian activity. An attempt to capture Chester Castle, to seize the arms there and to convey them to Ireland was only frustrated by prompt measures on the part of the Government. Then at Manchester, two Fenian prisoners were rescued from a prison van and the sergeant who guarded them was killed by a shot fired through the keyhole of the locked door; three men executed for this reckless enterprise were hailed as the "Manchester Martyrs." A project to free two prisoners from Clerkenwell in London, 13 December, by blowing up a portion of the prison wall, was nothing less than a stupid and cowardly outrage; for it caused the death of twelve persons and the injury of one hundred and twenty more, and had the prisoners themselves been in the yard at the time, they too would have been killed. While such performances as this inevitably cast discredit upon the whole movement for Irish independence, nevertheless, leading British statesmen became convinced that violence was nothing but the logical outcome of political repression, and that the only way to restore peace and quiet was to offer thoroughgoing measures of conciliation.

Disestablishment of the Irish Church (1869). — Gladstone, who, when called upon to form a Cabinet, had declared: "My mission is to pacify Ireland," thus found his hand greatly strengthened. Neither the disestablishment of the Irish Church, to which he was pledged, nor the improvement of the land tenure, which he regarded as almost equally pressing, had been demanded by the Fenians, yet he felt that, if these grievances were once removed, the movement recruited from discontent would wither at the roots. Gladstone's plan, laid before the Commons in March, 1869, provided that the Irish Church should cease to be a legal establishment after 1 January, 1871. Its ecclesiastical jurisdiction was to be abolished and the four Irish bishops were no longer to sit in the House of Lords. The Church's endowments were also to be taken away, with compensation

for vested interests, while Church buildings, episcopal residences and parsonages were reserved to a new voluntary organization which was to take the place of the old Establishment. The *Regium Donum* which the Government had allotted to the Presbyterians in Ireland since the time of William of Orange, as well as the Maynooth Grant,[1] was discontinued, but also with compensation. Private endowments made since the Restoration of 1660 were to be left untouched. The tithe rent charge was to be bought in by the landlords for a sum estimated at about £9,000,000. The remaining property of the Irish Church, consisting mainly of land and land rents, was computed to be worth some £6,000,000 or £7,000,000 more. According to Gladstone's plan, almost half this total of £16,000,000 would be employed in providing for the clergy, who were to have the option of continuing in their offices and drawing their revenues for life, or of settling for a lump sum. The surplus remaining was to be devoted to charity. Although the Episcopal clergy in Ireland denounced the bill as "highly offensive to Almighty God" and as "the greatest national sin ever committed," and although they were strongly backed by the English Conservatives, who regarded it as a menace to Protestantism and property, it passed the Lower House with little difficulty. The great struggle came in the House of Lords, though the Peers, instead of rejecting it forthwith, strove to defeat its main provisions by hostile amendments. All they accomplished, however, was to secure an increased compensation for the clergy of about £850,000 and an agreement that the disposal of the surplus should be left to Parliament. The Queen was largely responsible for the compromise. Much as she disliked the measure, she feared the consequences in case the Upper House persisted in its obstruction.

The Irish Land Act of 1870. — Having disestablished the alien Church which had for over three centuries been a grievance to the Irish, Gladstone, in 1870, undertook to deal with the land system. The difficulties were many and complex. In the first place, with comparatively few large industries or thickly populated cities, the bulk of the Irish were dependent upon the land. This excess of cultivators led to keen competition. Moreover, the Encumbered Estates Act of 1848 had transferred nearly one sixth of the soil to a class of land-jobbers who were more greedy and exacting than the old absentees. Leases and contracts were the exception rather than the rule, so that, in the majority of cases, the tenant could be arbitrarily evicted at six months' notice. The case of the tenant was all the worse since

[1] Toward the support of an Irish college founded, in 1795, for the education of priests.

he commonly made the improvements,[1] and, after he had thus rendered the holding more valuable, he was liable to an increase of rent and to eviction if he could not pay; though some evictions were defensible, to get rid of the thriftless and to consolidate holdings that were too small. In Ulster a better custom — known as the Ulster Tenant right — prevailed. There rents were fixed by a fair valuation instead of by competition, nor were they raised in consequence of improvements made by the tenant, who was entitled to compensation for unexhausted improvements when he left the estate; at the same time a tenant might remain in undisturbed occupancy so long as he paid his rent, though he might sell his good will and transfer to any occupant of whom the landlord should approve. Gladstone's Bill legalized, in the districts where it already prevailed, so much of the custom as provided compensation for arbitrary disturbance and the right of tenants, whether disturbed or not, to sell their unexhausted improvements, and provided a similar arrangement for the other parts of Ireland where the custom did not exist. By the so-called "Bright Clauses" subsequently added, loans were to be advanced by the Government to tenants who wished to buy their lands. In spite of these good features, the Act of 1870 failed to give satisfaction. For one thing, it failed to touch the evil of competitive rents, which were in most cases too high; moreover, while it hampered the landlord's power of eviction, it did not seriously check his exercise of that power, since frequently he found it more profitable — when he wanted to raise the rent, for example — to pay the compensation than to retain a tenant whom he regarded as undesirable. In a word, while the Irish desired many things, including fair rents and fixity of tenure, they got compensation — and not always an adequate amount — for disturbance and unexhausted improvements.

The Education Question. — Directly after the Irish Land Act had been carried, the Government pressed forward an epoch-making Education Bill. The subject needed attention sadly; for the English system, so far as it could be called a system, was incomparably below those prevailing in the United States, in Prussia, and in Switzerland. There were nearly four million children of school age, of whom nearly one half were unprovided for. About one million attended schools attached, for the most part, to the Church of England; they were supported by voluntary subscriptions, supplemented by fees and small Government grants, and were under Government inspection. Another million went to schools which received no Government grant, were

[1] In England the reverse was true. The landlords usually made the improvements.

uninspected, and often in a very unsatisfactory state. The grammar schools, founded after the dissolution of the monasteries by the Crown and by men who profited from the spoil of the monastic lands, were largely under Church control and were practically monopolized by the upper and middle classes.[1] Moreover, they did not furnish primary instruction, which was generally provided by private schools and tutors. For a long time the working classes were mainly dependent on apprenticeship, and when apprenticeship came to be superseded by the factory system, toward the end of the eighteenth century, two men who represented opposing policies undertook to supply the lads with primary instruction. One, Joseph Lancaster, a Quaker, who believed in nonsectarian education, was supported by the British and Foreign School Society, founded in 1808. The other was Andrew Bell, who advocated a form of instruction based on Church principles, and the National Society was founded in 1811 to carry out his policy. In 1833 Parliament made its first grant of £20,000, the bulk of which went to the National Society. Very slowly and meagerly parliamentary grants were increased, and a few halting steps in advance were taken — inspectors of schools were appointed and a committee of the Privy Council on Education was created.

The Education Bill of 1870. — The framers of the Act of 1870 were confronted by two main difficulties: the disinclination of many to pay rates for the education of other men's children, and the question of religious education; indeed, there were sharply conflicting views among those who agreed that the existing situation should be reformed. Some were for free, compulsory education, divorced altogether from religious control; others were opposed to free education; others, again, insisted on some form of religious teaching, either denominational or undenominational. The Government plan was to retain the voluntary schools where they were doing good work, and, in districts where they failed to meet the need, to set up schools under the charge of locally elected boards. These Board Schools, as they were called, were to be maintained partly by Government grant, partly by parents' fees, and partly from local rates. Attendance was not to be generally compulsory, the decision being left to the discretion of each school board. The question of religious instruction was eventually settled by a compromise which satisfied neither of the extreme parties. The voluntary schools were allowed to continue their religious instruction; but while the Government grants might be increased, they were

[1] In this class were the so-called "public schools" like Eton, Rugby, and Harrow, which prepared for the universities, were not free, and were practically beyond the reach of the poorer classes.

to receive no aid from the local rates.[1] In the Board Schools all denominational religious instruction was prohibited. Reading and explaining the Bible was allowed; but even that had to come at hours when parents who so desired might withdraw their children. Although the Act was very unpopular, especially among the Nonconformists, it marked a long step in the direction of providing instruction free of cost for all the children of the Kingdom. Within twenty years the number of schools had increased from 9000 to 20,000, accommodating 5,500,000 pupils, and attended on the average by nearly 4,000,000.[2]

The Civil Service Reform (1870). — Another far-reaching reform of this notable year 1870 was an Order in Council providing that candidates for the Civil Service should, at the discretion of the heads of departments, be subjected to competitive examinations. For seventeen years, posts in the Indian Civil Service had been filled by competitive examination, while, since 1855, a Civil Service Commission had selected candidates for the Home Service by examination, but only in the case of those nominated to competition.

Army Reform and the Ballot Act (1871, 1872). — The Secretary for War, and the First Lord of the Admiralty, were not behindhand in reforms relating to their respective departments, both in shaving down expenses and increase of efficiency. The only serious struggle arose over the abolition of the purchase of army officers' commissions. It was a grave defect in the existing system that capable men of training could be jumped by mere youths of wealth and influence; on the other hand, it was argued that discipline would suffer if men of inferior station were put in command of their social superiors, also, quite naturally, those who had expended large sums in the purchase of commissions were bitterly opposed to the change. As a concession to the latter it was provided that officers who had paid for their positions might retain them, and £7,000,000 was appropriated to compensate those who wished to withdraw. The bill passed the Commons, with some difficulty; but the Lords, while they did not venture to

[1] Even this, however, was allowed in an indirect way. School boards were permitted to pay fees, in the denominational schools, of the children of parents, who, though not paupers, were unable to meet the expense.

[2] In 1902 a Conservative Government abolished the special school boards set up in 1870, and placed both the Board and the Church schools under the supervision of the County and Borough Councils and provided that both types should be supported by Government grants supplemented by local taxes. At the same time, the actual control of the Church schools in each county or borough was vested in a committee of six, two from the Council, and four from the denomination to which the school belongs. Since most of the schools were of the Anglican communion, the Dissenters made vigorous protests, but owing to the opposition of the Lords, a measure framed by the Liberal Government in 1906 failed to pass.

reject it, sought to shelve it by delaying the second reading till the whole plan of army reorganization was before them. In consequence, Gladstone induced the Queen to declare the abolition of purchase by royal warrant, a proceeding for which the Prime Minister was loudly criticized. The Lords — who were now obliged to pass the Compensation Bill — took their revenge, in 1871, by rejecting a bill providing for vote by ballot and for more effective checks against corrupt practices in elections; but they had to give their assent the following year.

The Growing Unpopularity of the Gladstone Ministry (1871). — The Ministry, though it survived three years longer, had already drawn upon its head a varied and powerful opposition that was, in the end, to prove overwhelming. The Education Act had alienated the Nonconformists as well as the stanch High Churchmen, reductions in naval work in the dockyards had aroused the workingmen, and the abolition of purchase had stirred the wrath of the upper classes. Moreover, the conciliatory attitude of the Government in foreign policy was scornfully branded as too tame and submissive. While the Liberal party was growing steadily weaker, it was persistently attacked by Disraeli who was aiming to popularize the Conservatives chiefly by exploiting the Imperial idea, the union of the Mother Country and her Colonies in closer Imperial bonds. In a famous speech in 1872 he compared the Ministers to a "range of exhausted volcanoes."

The Supreme Court of Judicature Act (1873). — Although in a sadly crippled state, for more than one measure had to be withdrawn, the Gladstone Ministry was able to undertake, during the last few months of its career, one more far-reaching reform — a fundamental reorganization of the Law Courts and their procedure, which, however, required some years to complete. By the Judicature Act of 1873, and the supplementary Acts which followed, the three Common Law Courts, together with Chancery and various other tribunals, were consolidated into one Supreme Court of Judicature. This was to consist of two primary divisions: (1) the High Court of Justice, made up of three subdivisions, (*a*) Queen's Bench, (*b*) Chancery, (*c*) Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty; (2) the Court of Appeal. From the Court of Appeal cases went, as a last resort, to the House of Lords, which was strengthened, in 1876, by the addition of three Law Lords who held their title for life. A fourth was subsequently added.

The End of the First Gladstone Ministry (1874). — In 1874, Gladstone suddenly appealed to the country in a general election which resulted in an overwhelming victory for the Conservatives. By proposing a tax on spirits the vanquished Prime Minister had added to

his list a new enemy, the liquor dealers, who worked so actively against him that he wrote to his brother: "We have been borne down in a torrent of gin and beer" — doubtless an exaggeration of the influence of this particular factor. The Ministry had committed some blunders, it had made many enemies and alienated some of its friends; aside, however, from those who were actuated by strong religious convictions or insistent upon a more aggressive policy abroad, most of its opponents were from those whose class privileges and vested interests had suffered. It had come to power pledged to carry out a vast program of reform, and its achievements in constructive, progressive legislation had been surpassed by few Ministries of the century. Not only that, but it had reduced expenses materially and left the treasury in a most flourishing condition.

England and the Franco-Prussian War (1870–1871). — The two most important features in British foreign relations during the Gladstonian régime were the attitude of the Government toward the Franco-Prussian War and the adjustment of the *Alabama* claims. On 19 July, 1870, war broke out between France and Prussia. The causes were many and complicated. The French were jealous of the rising power of Prussia; they burned to recover the old Frankish territories to the left bank of the Rhine, their "natural frontier," while Napoleon III was anxious to unite his discontented subjects in a great war of conquest. Entrapped by the adroit diplomacy of Bismarck, who was striving to complete the unification of Germany under Prussian domination, the French rushed headlong and unprepared into the conflict. The result was a Prussian triumph. On 1 September, 1870, the Emperor, with an entire French army, was surrounded and captured at Sedan. On 19 September the siege of Paris began, and, after heroic suffering, the city yielded, 28 January, 1871. Ten days before, William, King of Prussia, was crowned German Emperor at Versailles, and by the peace concluded 3 March, France ceded Alsace and Lorraine and agreed to pay a war indemnity of five milliards of francs. The organization of the new German Empire was completed in 1871. After vain offers of mediation the British Government remained neutral. By his ruthless methods, Bismarck was able to prevent English popular sympathy for France from going too far, his most telling stroke being the publication, 25 July, 1870, of the draft of a treaty which he had induced the Emperor to submit to him, looking toward a French occupation of Belgium. The Queen, naturally inclined to favor the German cause, nevertheless, in the interests of humanity, tried to prevent the bombardment of Paris. This Bismarck resented as "petticoat sentimentality," hindering German designs. In order to prevent any

possibility of Great Britain and Russia combining to intervene in behalf of France, he sought to set the two Powers by the ears. To that end, he prompted Russia to seize the opportunity offered by the disturbed condition of Europe to abrogate the clause in the treaty of 1856 which excluded Russian war-ships from the Black Sea. Russia decided to take the step, and suddenly announced her intention in a circular letter issued 31 October, 1870. Great Britain protested stoutly against her proceeding independently of the other parties to the Treaty. Although a conference was assembled at London in December, the result was a foregone conclusion. Russia had her way.

The *Alabama* Claims. — The settlement of the *Alabama* claims was regarded by many as another diplomatic defeat for the Gladstone Ministry. Undoubtedly, however, Russell was at fault in allowing the *Alabama* to sail. In 1865, he admitted to Gladstone that "paying twenty millions down would be far preferable to submitting the case to arbitration." The question was complicated by the resentment aroused in the United States against the British recognition of the belligerent rights of the South, and by the setting forth of indirect claims amounting to £400,000,000.[1] After long and arduous negotiations had failed to accomplish anything, the two Governments finally arranged to appoint a joint commission to discuss the questions at issue and decide upon a plan of settlement. By the Treaty of Washington, 1871, it was agreed, among other things, that Great Britain should express her regret at the escape of the *Alabama* and the other Confederate cruisers, and that the assessment of damages should be referred to an international tribunal. This body, meeting at Geneva, was to consist of five members chosen by the rulers of Great Britain, the United States, Italy, Switzerland, and Brazil. As the result of its findings, announced in September, 1872, the United States was awarded £3,250,000. This Geneva Award marked the first step in international arbitration, and hence a notable advance in the progress of civilization, though the majority of the British people looked upon it in the light of a national humiliation.[2]

The Second Disraeli Ministry (1874–1880). — For the first time since the Peelite schism, the Conservatives, in 1874, came to office with

[1] These were based on the ground that Great Britain's encouragement prolonged the war, that her attitude was responsible for a large share of the Northern losses at sea, and on the expense incurred by the United States Government in pursuing the various cruisers which had sailed from British ports.

[2] By the Foreign Enlistment Act of 1870, making it "an offense to build a ship in circumstances which gave reasonable cause for belief that it would be used against a friendly state engaged in war," Great Britain provided for the future against any difficulties of this nature.

a decided majority. Their ranks were greatly strengthened by the accession of numbers from the commercial classes, who were alienated from the Liberal party because it was attracting the increasing support of the trade-unions and the artisans. A Jew who had achieved his earliest fame as a fop and a novelist, and who had entered public life advocating a union of the nobility and the masses against the capitalistic class, was the leader of a new combination of aristocracy and conservative commercialism. After the mass of legislation produced by the late Ministry, Disraeli's Government proposed to give the country a comparative rest. To be sure, he passed a few measures which indicated that he was still mindful of the welfare of the working classes and sought their support, but his most notable achievements were in the field of Imperial and foreign affairs, which may best be considered in another connection.

The Fall of the Beaconsfield Ministry (1880). — In dealing with world problems in Egypt, India, and the Near East, Disraeli — who was raised to the peerage as Earl of Beaconsfield in August, 1876 — showed vision and splendid audacity, though later events necessitated a reversal of the British attitude toward both Turkey and Russia. Beaconsfield's Ministry reached the high-water mark of its popularity about the time of his return in 1878 from the Congress of Berlin. Then agricultural depression, decline in trade, strikes, Afghan and Zulu wars, unsatisfactory budgets, dearth of remedial legislation, together with a policy of systematic obstruction initiated by the new Irish Home Rule party in the Commons, all contributed to prepare the way for its overthrow. On March 8, 1880, the Prime Minister appealed to the country in a general election. The cause of the Liberals was much assisted by the superiority of their political organization based on the model which Joseph Chamberlain, destined to become one of the dominant figures of the generation, had introduced from the United States into Birmingham, whence it spread through the country. Another factor in the election was the support which the Irish gave to the Liberals; but still more decisive forces in determining the election were the Nonconformists' hostility to the Prime Minister, the more or less vague desire for a fresh Administration, and the fervid speeches of the veteran Gladstone, who scored most scathingly the aggressive and costly foreign policy of the Conservatives as well as their apathy in domestic reform. When Beaconsfield learned of the defeat of his party at the polls, he resigned, 18 April, 1880, without waiting to face Parliament.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

See Chapter LIV below.

CHAPTER LIV

THE LAST TWO DECADES OF VICTORIA'S REIGN (1880–1901)

The Second Gladstone Ministry (1880–1885); the Bradlaugh Case (1880–1886). — Gladstone, now over seventy, became for the second time Prime Minister. At the opening of the new session, Charles Bradlaugh, elected from Northampton, raised an issue which culminated, after six years of struggle, in removing the last religious disability for membership in the House of Commons. As an atheist Bradlaugh objected to the required oath which contained the words: "So help me God," and insisted on taking an affirmation instead. When this was finally refused he offered to take the oath; but since he frankly stated that it meant nothing to him, the Speaker ruled against him. After a persistent struggle, during which he was unseated and reëlected many times and even expelled from the House by force, he was finally, January, 1886, allowed to take the oath, and he held his seat till his death. In 1888 he secured the passage of a bill legalizing the substitution — formerly limited to Quakers — of an affirmation for an oath, both in the Commons and in the Law Courts. Thus the question was settled once and for all.

The Origin and Rise of the Home Rule Party. — Meanwhile, Ireland was again demanding serious attention. In 1871 Isaac Butt, who entered Parliament in that year, launched a new policy for which he invented the name "Home Rule." In contrast to the Fenians, who aimed at an independent republic, it was his purpose to secure a separate legislature for Ireland by peaceful political methods. Owing to his genial temper and want of aggressiveness, the movement made little progress under his direction. The force which he lacked was supplied by Charles Stewart Parnell (1846–1891), who entered Parliament in 1875, and who two years later deliberately adopted and systematized a policy already resorted to on occasion, a policy which consisted in obstructing, in every way possible, the legislative policy of the House of Commons until the demands of the Irish Home-Rulers were considered. At first sight it would seem that Parnell was the very last

person to lead the Nationalist cause. He had not a drop of Irish blood in his veins, for his paternal ancestors were Englishmen who had settled in Ireland; moreover, he was a landowner and a Protestant. However, he had inherited from his mother — a daughter of the American admiral, Charles Stewart, who had fought in the war of 1812 — an intense hatred of the English. The attainment of Home Rule for Ireland grew rapidly to be his consuming ambition. He was a cold, undemonstrative man; but his force and energy were tremendous, and by sheer will power, with little or no literary training, he grew to be a powerful, incisive speaker. In addition to his leadership of the Home Rule party, he was, in 1879, elected to the presidency of the National Land League of Ireland, founded for the reduction of unjust rents and for the ultimate transfer of the ownership of land to the occupiers.

The Land Act of 1881. — Soon after Gladstone came to power, the situation in Ireland became so disturbing that in the session of 1881 the Liberals, despairing of maintaining order by ordinary law, forced through a new series of coercive measures in the teeth of determined opposition from the Irish Nationalists. By way of conciliation, however, Gladstone introduced a Land Act designed to remedy the defects of his measure of 1870 by granting the "three F's" demanded by the Irish — fair rents, fixity of tenure, and free sale of his interests by the tenant. The Act was to be enforced by a Land Court, which, however, took no action unless voluntarily resorted to by one of the parties, either landlord or tenant. It might fix a "judicial rent" which was to remain in force for fifteen years, during which period the tenant could not be evicted, except for non-payment of rent and certain other specified reasons. At the end of the fifteen years the landlord might resume possession with the Court's consent. Meanwhile, if at any time the occupier wished to part with his tenant right, he was allowed, subject to certain restrictions, to sell it for the best price he could get, though the landlord was to have the first option. In case the tenant wished to buy his holding, the Government was to loan three fourths of the purchase money. Advances were also made for emigration, and for improvements, including reclamation of waste lands. In spite of its well-meant provisions, the Act found favor neither with the landlord nor the tenants; the latter insisting that the rents were fixed at too high a rate.

The Phoenix Park Murders (1882). — Once more coercion and conciliation alike proved ineffective, although Parnell, after a short term in prison for inciting Irishmen to defeat the Land Act by intimidating tenants inclined to take advantage of its provisions, was released in the

spring of 1882, in accordance with an unofficial agreement to put an end to boycotting and to coöperate with the Liberal party. This "treaty" had scarcely been concluded when all England was shocked by the news that, 6 May, Lord Frederick Cavendish, the new Chief Secretary for Ireland, and Burke, the Permanent Under-Secretary, had been murdered by a band of Fenians in broad daylight in Phoenix Park, Dublin. The murderers escaped; but they were finally discovered and sent to the gallows in 1883. Parnell gained great credit with Gladstone by repudiating all connection with the outrage and offering to resign from the leadership of the Home Rule party; but the Government passed a Prevention of Crimes Bill which was regarded as one of the strongest coercive measures of the century. The year was marked by a series of murders in Ireland; but Parnell brushed aside with cold contempt the charge that he was in any way privy to them. Meantime, he had broken off all connection with an organization centering in the United States, the Clan-na-Gael, which under O'Donovan Rossa and other extremists, was now seeking to terrorize the English by attempts, that proved futile, to dynamite their public buildings, including the Houses of Parliament and the Tower of London.

The Franchise Bill of 1884. — Gladstone in February, 1884, introduced a new franchise bill, with the object of extending to the rural classes the same rights of voting as were enjoyed in the boroughs, and for establishing a substantially uniform franchise throughout the United Kingdom. The new measure went almost to the length of manhood suffrage, since domestic servants, bachelors living with their parents and paying no room rent, and those who had no fixed abode [1] were the only classes excluded, and involved an addition of some 2,000,000 voters, nearly four times the number added in 1832, and nearly twice the number added in 1867. Not only the Conservatives as a whole, but many Liberals, even in the Cabinet, insisted that it was dangerous to go to such lengths. While the Opposition in general felt that the agricultural laborer was too ignorant to vote, the Conservatives laid chief emphasis on the fact that Gladstone refused to provide for a redistribution of seats together with extension of the franchise. The Bill, however, passed the House of Commons with some difficulty, but was rejected in the Lords.

Its Passage. The Redistribution Act (1885). — The Queen strove as she had in 1869, to avoid a breach, though, before she had gone very far, influential members of the Conservative party had independently come to the conclusion that the measure might safely pass if joined to a satisfactory distribution bill. Gladstone, while he de-

[1] These latter were excluded by various residence qualifications.

murred at first, finally yielded to this stipulation, and, as a result, the Franchise Bill passed easily during the autumn session of 1884. The Redistribution Bill, which followed close upon its heels, did away with 160 seats, though, by substitutions and the increase of new constituencies, the membership of the House of Commons was increased from 658 to 670; moreover, except in the case of the City of London and boroughs with between 15,000 and 165,000 inhabitants, which retained two members each, the country was cut up into single member constituencies. The Bill became law in June, 1885.[1]

The Fall of the Second Gladstone Ministry. — The foreign policy of the first Gladstone Ministry had aroused widespread dissatisfaction, that of the second stirred the Opposition to fury. The Cabinet was loudly criticized for truckling to Russia in Afghanistan, for making concessions to the Boers in South Africa after British forces had suffered a humiliating defeat at their hands; and — what contributed more than anything else to drive the Liberals from power — for its feeble and halting policy in the Egyptian Sudan which resulted in the failure to relieve General Gordon and his consequent destruction at Khartum. Not only was the policy of the second Gladstone Ministry unsuccessful abroad, but its well-meant efforts to deal with the Irish problem had antagonized both the Home-Rulers and the Conservatives. Gladstone's first administration was notable for marked achievement in his peculiar field — financial administration and progressive legislation voicing the needs of middle class Liberalism. In his second, when he was confronted with a different class of problems, his prestige suffered distinctly. Finally, he resigned, 12 June, 1885, nominally on the passage of a hostile amendment to his budget.

The First Salisbury Ministry (July, 1885, to February, 1886). — The Marquis of Salisbury, who had succeeded to the headship of the Conservative party on the death of Beaconsfield, 19 April, 1881, now became Prime Minister in place of Gladstone. By the Ashbourne Act[2] of 1885 the Government advanced £5,000,000 to Irish tenants, who with loans from this fund might purchase their holdings and repay the debt by annual installments of 4 per cent for forty-nine years. The policy of creating a body of peasant proprietors as a cure for Irish

[1] Two years before, in 1883, another step in advance had been taken by the Corrupt Practices Act, which reduced the cost of general elections from £2,500,000 to £800,000. No candidate or his agent might, henceforth, spend more than a fixed sum for election expenses; also bribery, treating, and kindred practices were prohibited. Penalties were imposed which varied according to the gravity of the offense.

[2] The Act was named from its author, Lord Ashbourne, the Irish Lord Chancellor.

discontent, which was initiated by John Bright in 1870, and which formed a feature of the Act of 1881, was thus adopted and extended by the Conservatives.[1] This form of assistance to the Irish tenantry, together with the concession of increased power of self-government in local affairs, came to be the main substitutes which the Conservatives offered in place of the Home Rule demanded by the Nationalists. On the other hand, early in 1886, the Liberals identified themselves with the cause of the Home-Rulers.

Home Rule Adopted by Gladstone (December, 1885). — In the general election which took place in December, 1885, Gladstone had evaded committing himself on his future Irish policy; consequently the Irish refused to support the Liberal party, who, nevertheless, secured 335 members in the new Parliament to 249 Conservatives and 86 Nationalists. Scarcely were the elections over when, 17 December, a newspaper report announced that Gladstone was prepared to support, subject to certain conditions, a Home Rule proposition. While he declared that the statement had been published without his knowledge or authority, it represented his views with substantial accuracy. At any rate it soon became generally known that he was for "a plan of duly guarded Home Rule."

The Third Gladstone Ministry (February to August, 1886). The First Home Rule Bill. — Salisbury was forced to resign, 28 January, 1886, and was succeeded by Gladstone, who in constructing his third Ministry, informed each man whom he asked to take office that it would be the aim of the Government to determine whether or not Ireland should be given an independent legislature. Accordingly, many of his old associates, including John Bright, refused to join. Lord Randolph Churchill achieved the result, which proved big with consequences, of stirring up Ulster to oppose the impending project,[2] and at a meeting in Manchester, employed two terms which soon became generally current — "Unionist and Separatist." On 8 April, 1886, Gladstone moved for leave to bring in an Irish Government Bill.

[1] Subsequent Land Purchase Acts were passed in 1887, 1891, 1896, and 1903. The chief weakness in the scheme was that it availed little in the congested districts where the tenants were too poor to purchase their holdings even with the liberal aid of the Government. The Congested Districts Board has undertaken, with a fair degree of success, to remedy that situation.

[2] In the past, Ulstermen had been among the leaders in the endeavor to secure an independent government for Ireland. But there was a strong Protestant element in the district, and there were vast industrial interests centering chiefly in Belfast, and their change of front was due to the fear that their religion and their wealth might be exploited by the poor Roman Catholic element who would dominate the Irish legislature.

It provided for the establishment of a legislative body to sit in Dublin for the purpose of making the laws and controlling the administration of Ireland, and for the withdrawal of Irish members from the Parliament at Westminster. While the Irish legislature was to have the power of imposing taxes, this was not to include customs or certain excises, which were reserved to the Imperial body, though after Ireland's share of the common expenses had been provided for, any surplus remaining was to be handed over to the Irish Exchequer. Moreover, certain areas of legislation, relating chiefly to the Crown, the army and the navy, navigation and trade, were also to be dealt with by the British Parliament exclusively. The main defect in the Bill and the one most criticized was the exclusion of the Irish members from Westminster; indeed, Gladstone himself admitted that this was an open question. Whatever chances the measure may have had in the House of Commons were ruined by a schism in the Liberal party. Chief among the leaders of this secession movement — known as Liberal Unionism — were the Marquis of Hartington and Joseph Chamberlain.

The Defeat of the First Home Rule Bill and the Fall of the Third Gladstone Ministry (1886). — In spite of a noble and eloquent speech by Gladstone, the Home Rule Bill was defeated on the second reading by 343 to 313, with 93 Liberals voting on the Opposition side. Another general election followed, which in Ireland was marked by intense violence, while in England the strife was confined to words. John Bright in writing to his former leader declared that, while he would do much to "clear the rebel party from Westminster," he could not give his assent to a measure which he regarded as unjust to Protestant loyal Ulster, and various letters of his during the campaign carried great weight. On the other hand, such was the magic of Gladstone's presence, that, even though he was puzzling and persuasive rather than convincing, he won converts wherever he went, yet in the end he was completely defeated. Salisbury, who had been peculiarly acrid in his insistence on the inability of the Irish to govern themselves, entered on his second term as Prime Minister, lasting from 1886 to 1892.

"Parnellism and Crime" (1887). — The Irish problem continued to be the storm center of politics. Early in March, 1887, Salisbury's nephew, Mr. Arthur Balfour, became Chief Secretary for that distracted country. Hitherto known chiefly as a young man of languid, elegant tastes and as a writer on deep philosophical subjects, he proved to be, during his four years' tenure, a vigorous and effective, if somewhat ruthless, administrator. On 28 March, as a means of combating

the violent and murderous activities of the extremists, he introduced a new Crimes Bill which contained the novel feature that its provisions should be permanent. While it was being enacted into law, intense excitement was aroused by a series of articles in the *Times*, entitled "Parnellism and Crime," charging the Irish leader and his followers with the employment of violence and intimidation to gain their ends, and even with sanctioning murder. On 18 April appeared the facsimile of a letter, purporting to be signed by Parnell and dated 15 May, 1882, in which he was made to declare that he had only condemned the Phoenix Park murders as a matter of policy. Though Parnell forthwith denounced the letter as a forgery, its publication had the effect of facilitating the passage of the Crimes Act. At length, in July, 1888, Frank Hugh O'Donnell, one of those against whom charges had been directed in the recent articles, brought suit against the *Times* for libel.

Parnell's Temporary Triumph (1889). Final Ruin and Death (1891). — When, at the trial, the counsel for the newspaper produced new letters alleged to have been written by Parnell, the Irish chieftain was at length roused from the indifference which he had displayed hitherto. On 6 July, he issued in the House of Commons a formal denial of any connnection with the letters, and, feeling that he would be unlikely to obtain justice from a Middlesex jury, asked for a select committee to investigate the question of their origin. The Government, refusing his request, took the unprecedented action of appointing a special commission of three judges to inquire into the whole subject of the charges made by the articles on "Parnellism and Crime." The sessions of the Commission extended over more than a year, from September, 1888, to November, 1889; but, before its work was half completed, the author of the letters attributed to Parnell was discovered. He proved to be one Richard Pigott, a broken-down Irish journalist, who had sold them to the *Times*. Confessing the forgery, he fled across the Channel and, 1 March, 1889, he shot himself in Madrid to escape the officers on their way to arrest him. Thus ended the most dramatic feature of the inquiry. The Commission issued its report 13 February, 1890. Though many of the charges in the *Times* against the other Irish leaders were sustained, Parnell was acquitted of all complicity. The proprietors of the newspaper had to pay him £5000 damages and to assume all the costs of the investigation.

Scarcely had he won his triumph, which promised much for Home Rule, when he and the cause were overtaken by a crushing reverse. In November he was involved as co-respondent

in a divorce suit brought by Captain O'Shea, the result of which was to destroy Parnell's credit with the morally strict and to furnish others with a pretext for repudiating him. Gladstone at first declined to be "a censor and a judge of faith and morals"; but owing to the decided attitude of the strong Nonconformist element in his party and the unmistakable trend of public opinion,[1] he decided, after some hesitation, to throw Parnell over. "The English wolves howl for my destruction" was the bitter comment of the discredited chieftain, who defiantly resisted all efforts to induce him to resign. The result was to produce a schism among his followers; after a long hard struggle 44 of the Nationalists chose Justin McCarthy as their leader, while a minority of 26 stuck to Parnell. During the few remaining months of his life he fought an uphill but hopeless fight to regain his lost ascendancy. He came to advocate separation, he bitterly denounced those of the opposing camp who had repudiated him, and had in his turn to submit to scathing personal abuse. He died, 6 October, 1891, at the age of forty-six. "The strongest and the strangest of the Irish political leaders . . . he had brought Home Rule from the clouds and made it the leading issue in the party conflict." John Redmond took his place as head of the minority.

The Queen's Jubilee and the Growth of Imperialism (1887). — These years, during which the Irish problem was passing through such acute stages, were marked by a striking revival of the popularity of the Monarchy, due to the Queen's emergence from the seclusion in which she had remained since the Prince Consort's death and to the growing strength of the Imperialistic sentiment which Disraeli had done so much to promote. The Jubilee of 1887, marking the fiftieth anniversary of Victoria's accession, was at once a mighty manifestation and a potent factor in the revival of the royal popularity and of the Imperialistic sentiment which had such an effect in fostering it. The pomp and circumstance, the crowds and pageantry which attended the celebration, together with the simultaneous outbursts of enthusiasm which the event called forth in the Colonies and in India were no mere empty vaporings. "Thenceforth the Sovereign was definitely regarded as the living symbol of the unity not merely of the British Nation but of the British Empire."

The Last Years of the Second Salisbury Ministry. — In 1888 an important Act was passed creating for England and Wales elective County Councils which took over many of the administrative functions of the justices of the peace; London was made a separate administrative county, though the ancient rights and privileges of the City

[1] The Roman Catholic clergy also declared against Parnell.

were left undisturbed. In 1892, since Parliament was nearing the end of its septennial term, the Conservative Government, with a good record behind it, appealed to the country in a general election. Its financial administration had been good, in 1891 it had abolished fees in the public elementary schools, and, in addition to the Irish land purchase Acts, had taken the first steps to assist English tenants and agricultural laborers to buy small holdings. Tendencies toward State socialism and protection were becoming more and more marked. As yet, however, the Liberals were less ready to accept the new situation; for they still based their policy mainly upon "the extension of political equality and the abolition of privilege." The Conservatives, on the other hand, just because they were the guardians of privilege and vested interests, preferred to assist the masses rather than to increase their powers. With regard to foreign affairs, the Salisbury Ministry, while aiming to be conciliatory, asserted British claims with dignity and force.

The General Election of 1892. — Gladstone, endeavoring to combine the radicals of his party with the old line Liberals by advocating various progressive measures, nevertheless made Home Rule the main campaign issue. The Conservatives, as a substitute for Home Rule, proposed to extend the peasant proprietary by further appropriations for land purchase and to grant the Irish a limited amount of local government by establishing, with some modifications, the English system of County Councils. In England, Gladstone was beaten, but he got enough votes in Wales and Scotland to give him, with the aid of eighty-one Irish Nationalists, a majority of forty for Home Rule. Salisbury remained in office to face the new Parliament and only resigned when a vote of no confidence was carried, 15 August.

The Fourth Gladstone Ministry and the Second Home Rule Bill. — Though many of Gladstone's own party desired to avoid the issue, he proceeded to introduce, 13 February, 1893, his second Home Rule Bill, which differed from the first chiefly in the provision that eighty Irish representatives were to sit in the Parliament at Westminster, but with the privilege of voting only on matters of Irish concern. The main objection to this provision was that it would make the existing system of Cabinet Government practically impossible, since the tenure of the Government depended upon a majority in the Commons, which it might have when the Irish members were present, and fail to have when they were absent. Eventually the Bill passed the Lower House, 1 September, by a majority of thirty-four, with the "in and out" clause omitted, raising the new objection that Ireland was given a decided advantage over Wales and Scotland; since the Irish members had a voice in Welsh and Scotch internal concerns and independent

control over their own. Throughout the debates, the excitement and bitterness were intense; indeed, 27 July, some of the members went so far as to resort to personal violence, for the first time, it is said, in parliamentary history. It was all in vain, however, since the measure was rejected in the House of Lords on the second reading, by a vote of 419 to 41. As a matter of fact, many members of the Lower House had voted for the measure only because they foresaw this result.

Ireland in the Last Decade of Victoria's Reign. — Nearly twenty years elapsed before a measure of Home Rule again succeeded in passing the Commons. During the interval, there was a period of comparative peace in Ireland, and the issue played a relatively small part in practical politics. Many reasons contribute to explain this. For one thing, the Conservatives, who were in power from 1895 to 1905, continued their policy of trying to "kill Home Rule by kindness," new Land Purchase Acts were passed, and, in 1898, a Local Government Act extended to Ireland the same degree of local government which the English enjoyed.[1] In the previous year, largely through the efforts of Mr. (now Sir) Horace Plunkett, the Irish Agricultural Organization Society was founded, and contributed much to the prosperity of the country by fostering coöperative farming and the development of the dairy and poultry industry;[2] at the same time, some forty credit banks had been established to assist the farmers with loans. In 1899, the work was made more effective by the creation of a new Department for Agriculture, Industries and Technical Instruction, with Mr. Plunkett as Vice-President. Although there has been friction with the Government and evictions have not wholly ceased, Ireland has been growing steadily better off, and, during the first ten years of the present century, the decrease of population has been less than in any decade since the potato famine. Another factor which tended for a number of years to weaken the force of the Home Rule movement was the the split in their ranks resulting from the disgrace of Parnell. It was not till 1899 that the two sections of the Nationalists were reunited under John Redmond.

The Home Rule Problem. — Many factors have contributed to render the Irish problem so difficult as to be almost insoluble. In the first place, there is the baffling difference of racial temperament.

[1] In 1894 a Local Government Bill had supplemented the Act of 1888 by establishing throughout England and Wales elective district and parish councils.

[2] This was a happy departure, for the soil of Ireland was in general too wet for tillage, and the improved methods of transportation had made it practically impossible for the Irish to withstand the overseas competition in the supply of meat. Parts of Ireland suffer still from insufficient railway facilities, giving Denmark an advantage in supplying the London market, even with poultry and dairy products.

Religious antagonism also was for centuries an element of discord, though, since the Disestablishment Act of 1869, it has perhaps been less acute. Furthermore, the Irish have been embittered by poverty, which, even if — to a large degree — due to the unfortunate physical features of the country and to a certain lack of industrial aptitude, was greatly fostered by misgovernment as well as by absenteeism, middlemen, and rackrenting. Of late years, unquestionably, the Government has done its best to improve the situation; but it has always been handicapped by party differences, by the long tradition of political oppression in the past, and the natural desire of the Irish for independence. How far Home Rule would solve the question it is difficult to predict. The Irish Nationalists argue that the Union was brought about by fraud and hence should be repealed; that Ireland best understands her own needs and hence should govern herself; and that, though they have a representation in Parliament, their members accomplish little except by obstruction, save at times when the two great parties are so evenly divided as to give them the balance of power. These arguments have appealed to some Englishmen; others have contended that, right or wrong, the Irish should be listened to; while to others, again, the strongest argument in favor of Home Rule is that a legislative body at Dublin would relieve the pressure on the Imperial Parliament, which is sadly overworked. On the other hand, much has been urged against Home Rule. For one thing, it has been argued that the Irish are unfit to govern themselves. Secondly, it would not only destroy the integrity of the British Empire, but, owing to the position of Ireland, it would be strategically dangerous to give her an independent government. Thirdly, since Ireland is not self-sufficing, it would be an impossible task to adjust the financial burdens. Fourthly, it would be unfair to the Ulster Protestants. Finally, none of the schemes yet suggested would be workable — either the admission or the exclusion of Irish members at Westminster or the "in and out" arrangement. Apparently the best solution would be a scheme corresponding to the system in vogue in the United States and Canada, with a Federal Parliament[1] at Westminster for the whole United Kingdom, and separate bodies for England, Wales and Scotland, and northern and southern Ireland. Even this, however, would not be wholly without objection, since there is a strong Roman Catholic element in some of the counties of Ulster.

The Resignation of Gladstone (March, 1894). — Gladstone's patience with the House of Lords was almost exhausted after they defeated

[1] This arrangement is known as devolution, arrived at by a process precisely the reverse of that by which federation is achieved.

his Home Rule Bill. When they suggested various amendments to the Local Government Bill of 1894 he was provoked to declare that: "the differences between the two Chambers disclosed a state of things of which we are compelled to say that, in our judgment, it cannot continue," a statement which occurred in what proved to be his last speech in the House of Commons. Not only had he failed in his supreme effort to carry Home Rule, but he had shattered his party as well. The immediate occasion of his retirement, however, was his inability to bring the majority to support him in his opposition to increased naval estimates, though the only reasons which he offered in his letter of resignation were his advanced age, and his failing eyesight and hearing.[1]

The Third Salisbury Ministry (June, 1895, to July, 1902). — For a brief interval of little more than a year the Liberal party continued in power, until June, 1895, when Salisbury returned to head his third and last Ministry. Some of the chief Liberal Unionists took office in the new Government, among them the Marquis of Hartington, now Duke of Devonshire, and Joseph Chamberlain. The latter had entered public life as a Radical, but in his new position as Colonial Secretary he devoted himself to a zealous exploitation of the policy of Imperialism which he had recently adopted. Regarding the Colonies and the dependencies as the real source of Great Britain's wealth and strength he determined that it should be her guiding aim to develop and consolidate the Empire. Among the most important domestic measures of the Ministry during its first years were the Irish Local Government Act, 1898, and an Act establishing borough councils in London, 1899.

The Venezuela Boundary Dispute (1895–1899). — Toward the close of 1895, Grover Cleveland, President of the United States, had nearly brought on a war with Great Britain by a belligerent message sent to Congress 17 December. Declaring that Salisbury's refusal to submit to arbitration her territorial claims in a boundary dispute with Venezuela was a violation of the Monroe Doctrine, he asked Congress to authorize him to appoint a boundary commission whose findings should be "imposed upon Great Britain by all the resources of the United States." Salisbury's calm and courteous attitude alone averted war. Convinced of the justice of his cause he submitted it to the commission appointed by Cleveland, and the proposal to enforce its findings was dropped. The commission, made up of two American and two British judges with a Russian jurist as president, rendered, in October, 1899, a unanimous opinion conceding to Great Britain practically all she

[1] Gladstone died, 19 May, 1898, and, 30 July, Bismarck, the creator of German unity and the most commanding figure in Europe, followed him to the grave.

had claimed. Meantime, Salisbury's good offices in preventing an anti-American coalition of the European powers, when the Spanish war broke out in the spring of 1898, contributed to bring about a friendlier feeling between his country and the United States.

Death and Character of the Queen (1901).—The year 1899 was sadly marked by the outbreak of a war between Great Britain and the Boers in South Africa, a war the embers of which still smoldered when Queen Victoria died, 22 January, 1901, in her eighty-second year, after completing the longest reign in English history. Doubtless the grief at her death was more widespread and heartfelt than that inspired by any of her predecessors. This was partly due to her personal character. During her last years, the feeling against her German husband and against her selfish isolation following his death had been forgotten, and people recalled her virtues, her courage, her honesty, her unblemished reputation, and her interest in their welfare, which she had come to manifest more and more as time went on. Possessed of no great intellectual power, Victoria was gifted with uncommon will and energy and strength of character; nevertheless, she recognized the constitutional limitations of the Crown as no previous Sovereign had done, and she had the tact to yield to the expressed will of her subjects when the occasion demanded it. On the other hand, in spite of her customary high sense of duty, she on occasion allowed personal considerations to influence her in ways that conflicted at times with the broadest public interests. Her prolonged indulgence in private grief put a barrier between her and her subjects, and, since she was fond of Scotland, she went there, after 1854, for a part of every year, while she visited Ireland only four times during her whole reign, and from 1861 to 1900 never set foot in the country at all — a discrimination which was keenly felt by the sensitive Irish. Her German connections and her devoted attachment to their dynastic interests affected, frequently and strongly, her attitude toward many foreign questions and often aroused irritation and suspicion among the Ministers and subjects. However, she followed public business and performed her public duties conscientiously and punctiliously. And she possessed an influence out of all proportion to her constitutionally recognized powers; for her long experience and her detachment from party passions gave great weight to her views, and she was very frank and honest in expressing them to her Ministers. In the robustness of her nature, her simplicity, her charitable interest in the poor, her domestic ideals, as well as in her rather masterful temper, she represented the best type of the average English people. While strict in the standards of conduct which she set for those about her,

she was very tolerant in matters of religious opinion. True to her feminine nature she was guided usually by sentiment rather than principles of reason and logic; but her sentiments were usually wholesome and her instincts were right.

The Close of the Reign and its Problems. — Yet the cause of Victoria's final popularity was due less to personal qualities than to the fact that she was regarded as the outward and visible sign of the Imperial unity that was the outgrowth largely of the last quarter of a century of her life. "She and her Ministers . . . encouraged the identification of the British sovereignty with the the unifying spirit of Imperialism, and she thoroughly reciprocated the warmth of feeling for herself and her office, which the spirit engendered in her people at home and abroad." The reign was one of astounding material progress and of great political progress as well; but her death left many problems pressing for solution — the question of preferential tariffs in the Dominions, Imperial federation, the status of Ireland, the relations between the House of Commons and the House of Lords, relations between capital and labor, and of provisions to be made for the poor in the case of old age, sickness and unemployment. Something has been done during the reigns of her son and grandson to deal with those problems, though many phases of them still await settlement.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

See chs. XLVIII ff. Also T. H. Ward, *Reign of Queen Victoria* (2 vols., 1887), a coöperative work. C. A. Whitmore, *Six Years of Unionist Government, 1886–1892* (1892). H. Whates, *Third Salisbury Administration, 1895–1900* (1901). R. H. Gretton, *A Modern History of the English People* (1913), I, 1880–1898.

Biography. In addition to works cited ch. LII, H. D. Traill, *The Marquis of Salisbury* (1890). Lord E. Fitzmaurice, *Life of Earl Granville* (2 vols., 1905). J. H. Parnell, *Charles Stewart Parnell* (1914). R. B. O'Brien, *Life of Charles Stuart Parnell* (3 vols., 1898), very outspoken. W. Churchill, *Life of Lord Randolph Churchill* (2 vols., 1906), especially good for the Fourth Party. Rosebery, *Lord Randolph Churchill* (1896). T. E. Kebbel, *Lord Beaconsfield and other Tory Memoirs* (1907). J. Bryce, *Studies in Contemporary Biography* (1903). B. Holland, *Life of Spencer Compton, Eighth Duke of Devonshire* (1911). A. L. Thorold, *The Life of Henry Labouchere* (1913). Sir H. Maxwell, *The Life and Letters of George Villiers, Fourth Earl of Clarendon* (2 vols., 1913).

For a critical bibliography of the successive English Ministries from 1865 to 1902 see Low and Sanders, 503–506.

For Ireland and Home Rule, see bibliography in Turner's *Ireland and England*, 471–480; see also Low and Saunders, 496, and *Cambridge Modern*

History, XII, 863–869. Besides the works therein cited see A. Balfour, *Aspects of Home Rule* (1912); E. Childers, *The Framework of Home Rule* (1912); A. V. Dicey, *England's Case against Home Rule* (1887) and *A Fool's Paradise* (1913); Lord Eversley, *Gladstone and Ireland* (1912).

Selections from the sources. Adams and Stephens, nos. 267–276. Robertson, pt. II, XXIX–XXXII, app. 439–441.

CHAPTER LV

VICTORIAN AND POST-VICTORIAN ENGLAND

General Features. — The period from the First Reform Bill to the beginning of the twentieth century is so complex in character and so teeming with achievement that only the barest outline of its main features can be attempted. In literary production it challenges comparison with any age except the Elizabethan. In painting the outlook has been notable. History has been transformed almost into a new science, while significant work has been done in philosophy and other fields of humanistic scholarship. However, the really epoch-making achievements of the Victorian era have been in the field of pure science and in its practical applications, particularly in transportation and communication. The doctrine of evolution has revolutionized modern thinking, while steam and electricity, by infinitely multiplying means of distribution, have developed the possibilities of production to a point hitherto undreamed of. Moreover, but for steam navigation, the postal service and the telegraphs, the amazing growth of the British Empire and the unity which pervades it would have been impossible. Finally, the democratization of the United Kingdom, — the triumph of popular majority rule, with the consequent breaking down of class privileges, the growth of State intervention in the interest of the masses, and the increasing humanitarian spirit, — is a distinctive feature of this wonderful age.

The Condition of the Church. — The religious and moral enthusiasm inspired by the Wesleyan revival began to spend its force early in the nineteenth century, at least so far as the upper classes were concerned, and the Established Church — except for the Evangelicals — hardly warmed by the fervor of the moment, relapsed into its customary state of chilly conservatism. Its bishops were pompous dignified figures who had secured their high offices through family connection or personal influence, who enjoyed ample incomes and extensive powers, and who, with little regard for purely religious work, devoted themselves to politics, to the administration of their estates, to society and scholarly leisure. Among the " high and dry " Anglicans

there were two types. The clergy of the better sort were kindly and respectable, but idle and worldly. The less edifying representatives of this party were the "two-bottle orthodox," the hard drinking sporting parsons who came from the hunting field to read a funeral service, their pink coat and top-boots barely covered by a cassock. More earnest were the few on whom the Evangelical revival had left an enduring mark, and who manifested their enthusiasm in practical work, in prison reform, antislavery agitation, and the reformation of manners; as a rule, however, they were limited and narrow in their ideas. The greatest extremes of wealth and poverty existed in the Church. While the bishops and a few favored clergy were in receipt of rich revenues, the rank and file of the country parsons drew only meager stipends, besides which more than half the Church livings were held by non-resident rectors and vicars, usually represented by underpaid curates. Akin to the evil of non-residence, and made possible by it, was the distressing prevalence of pluralities. Furthermore, men of influence, Churchmen and laymen alike, heaped their relatives and supporters with fat benefices. There was already much discontent, when a series of events occurred which threatened to shake the Establishment to its very foundations. In 1828 came the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, followed by the Catholic Relief Bill in 1829. The passage of the Reform Bill, three years later, gave an impulse to a more radical policy in ecclesiastical as well as political legislation; Lord Grey advised the bishops "to set their houses in order," and, in 1833, came the Irish Church Temporalities Act. The attempt to meet the threatened dangers resulted in the Oxford Movement, so called because it was started largely by a group of young Oxford scholars, and for some years had its center in the University. Its main aim was to emphasize the antiquity and authority of the Church, partly for the purpose of asserting its independence of State control, and partly for the purpose of stimulating the imagination and arousing spiritual and moral enthusiasm in its members. Another powerful stimulus to the Movement was the romantic revival in literature, the glorification of medievalism, which Scott had done so much to foster.

The Beginning of the Oxford Movement. — John Henry Newman, who came to be the dominating figure in the Oxford group, dated the beginning of the Movement from a sermon on "National Apostasy" preached by John Keble, 14 July, 1833. A small but slowly increasing number of earnest-minded young men became convinced that if the Church of England was to be saved, it must be justified on other grounds than mere expediency and custom. To promulgate

their teachings they started a series of *Tracts for the Times*, in which they sought to revive and emphasize old Catholic beliefs which had been discredited and forgotten, and to assert the continuity of the visible Church from the time of Christ and the apostles.

The Results of the Movement. — Before long, however, grave difficulties and divisions arose. The liberals opposed the dogmatism of the Movement, the "two-bottle orthodox" were alienated by its asceticism, while both combined with the Evangelicals to resist its growing Romeward tendencies. A crisis was precipitated, in 1841, by the appearance of Tract XC, in which Newman sought to prove that the Thirty-nine Articles were not necessarily in contradiction with ancient Catholic doctrine. A storm of indignation arose, the Tract was condemned by the Oxford authorities, and, in 1843, Newman resigned his living at St. Mary's and went into retirement. Partly impelled by more zealous spirits, and partly by his own meditations, to the conclusion that the Church of England was a schismatical offshoot of the true Catholic faith, he went over to the Roman Catholic communion in 1845. A few other prominent men took the same step, and the Oxford Movement broke up. Although it had failed in its efforts to check the influx of liberalism and to assert the Church's independence of State control, its results were various and far-reaching. As a reaction against the attempt to identify Christianity with Roman Catholicism, a small but influential body of thinkers, including Newman's own brother, were driven to skepticism. Others less radical, for example Charles Kingsley, formed the nucleus of a new liberal party — the Broad Churchmen — which gained strength from the dissensions between Tractarians, the Evangelicals, and the old high and dry Anglicans, though a further impetus toward both skepticism and a more liberal school of Churchmanship came from the scientific developments of the century. Such were the opposing tendencies to which the Oxford Movement gave rise. On the other hand, the unshrinking attitude of those who remained true to Anglicanism stimulated the growth of a type of High Churchmen, that put increased emphasis on the Catholic apostolic traditions of the Church of England. Among them were Gladstone, and with this party Keble threw in his lot. An indirect result of the Movement was to reawaken a love for beauty and art in religious worship, to restore ancient ceremonies, and to stimulate an enthusiasm for medieval architecture. Such ritualism has become a usual though not invariable accompaniment of High Churchmanship, inspiring piety and works of charity in those who are best reached through the channels of æsthetic emotion, and it has brought light and color into the drab, unlovely lives

of many who have little or no cultural influence outside their religion.

Lay Patronage and the Secession from the Church of Scotland. — Meantime, the Church of Scotland had been rent by a secession, which, though impelled by different motives, had this in common with the Oxford Movement, that it aimed to free the Church from secular control. An Act of 1711 had restored to lay patrons the right, taken from them twenty years before, of presenting candidates to benefices. Although this was opposed by many Presbyterians, and even resulted in the secession of a small body, the crisis leading to the great disruption did not come till 1833. The extension of the political franchise strengthened the party who held that pastors should not be forced on unwilling congregations by a few privileged persons. As a result, the "Veto Act" was carried through the General Assembly in 1834, providing that the dissent of the majority of the male members of a congregation would be sufficient to exclude any minister presented. After the courts, in two test cases, had sustained the patrons, a proposal was made to abolish lay patronage altogether, and, when the Government refused its assent, some four hundred of the clergy, under the lead of Dr. Chalmers, seceded in 1843, and constituted the Free Church of Scotland. In 1902 the bulk of this body combined with the United Presbyterians — an organization, dating from 1847, of various other groups outside the Establishment — to form the United Free Presbyterian Church. In 1874 lay patronage was abolished in the Church of Scotland, and strong efforts are now being made to bring the two great bodies again into one fold.

General Tendencies of Victorian Literature. — The reign of Victoria marks a distinct era in literature. At her accession, in 1837, the great figures of the romantic revival were all dead except Wordsworth, who had done his best work long before. While new writers were in the making, the death of Byron, in 1824, and of Scott, in 1832, was followed by an arid interval in poetry and novel writing, when Felicia Hemans set the standard, and elegant "Keepsakes" and "Books of Beauty" were the vogue. The literature to come was profoundly influenced by the growth of democracy, by the new scientific temper, and the growing humanitarian spirit. There was an increased intensity of moral earnestness, a desire to appeal to the masses — who for the first time in history began to form a considerable circle of readers — to form their taste and to voice their unrest, by denouncing the evils from which they suffered under the existing political, social, and industrial system.

Prose Writers. Macaulay. — Thomas Babington Macaulay (1800–1859), preëminent as an essayist at the beginning of the period, was

not one of the apostles of discontent; active in public affairs from his entrance in Parliament, in 1830, until within a few years of his death, he stoutly championed, both in his speaking and writing, the dominant Whiggism and *laissez-faire*. Having done his part toward securing the extension of the franchise, in 1832, and the reforms which followed, he was content to depict with complacent satisfaction the achievements of his party. While his long and varied series of essays — most of which were originally contributed to the *Edinburgh Review* — and his stirring *Lays of Ancient Rome* are famous, his great undertaking was his *History of England*, which centers about the Revolution of 1688, and which he left uncompleted. He showed himself to be a master of clear, picturesque narrative, which he enriched by apt illustrations drawn from copious stores of knowledge, and he excelled in graphic portraiture of political situations. On the other hand, he went too far in his attempts to be vivid, he was partisan, and he lacked the ability to delineate complex characters, often presenting little more than bundles of contrasted traits. But he was a forthright, virile figure, who did much to shape the historical view of the general reader for some time to come.

Carlyle. — Thomas Carlyle (1795–1881), essayist, historian, and miscellaneous writer, was, in his tempestuous preaching against the materialism and what he fancied to be pretentious shams of the age, a striking contrast to Macaulay. He first attracted attention with *Sartor Resartus*, or the "tailor patched," which appeared in 1833–1834. To some degree a spiritual autobiography, it is also a scathing jeremiad, lighted by flashes of grim humor and noble prophecy, against hollow pretense and false ideals, against the tendency to glorify mechanical progress rather than the things of the spirit. His *French Revolution* is unique in the field of historical literature. The picture is distorted, but it tells the story with a fire and dramatic intensity that leaves an indelible impression on the mind. The *Letters and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell* is made up of skillfully selected extracts interpreted with incisive comments by Carlyle; but one-sided as it is, it completely vindicated Cromwell from the charges of hypocrisy which had hung over him for two centuries. The *History of Frederick the Great* gave him another opportunity to champion a strong, though ruthless and cynical man, and to exhibit his rare genius for epic narration. Meantime, in essays and lectures he was constantly preaching on the "eternal verities" and "the government of the best," and railing against unbaked democracy — "the universal Morison's Pill" with which its advocates expected to cure all the ills of society and the body politic. In reply to the accusation that he was sponsor for the doctrine

that "might makes right," he insisted that the true purport of his teaching was that "right makes might." By virtue of his inimitable style, with its strange words and wild exclamations, he did succeed in arousing many from their spiritual torpor; but, as a practical reformer, he had little that was tangible to contribute.

Arnold, Ruskin, and Newman. — Matthew Arnold (1822–1888) began his literary career as a poet. His verses, superb in their classic purity and finish, stand in striking contrast to the glowing romanticism of the previous generation, but are chilled by austere self-restraint. It was as a literary critic of nice discrimination, as an advocate of liberalism in Biblical interpretation, and as an apostle of culture — or, to use his own words, of "sweetness and light" — to the philistine middle classes, that he did his most distinctive work. Perhaps the perfection of prose in nineteenth-century England was reached by John Henry Newman (1801–1890), especially in his *Idea of a University* and the *Apologia pro Vita Sua*, the latter of which is one of the most profoundly human in the world's literature of spiritual biography, wherein he sought to reveal to his countrymen the great visible Church as an infallible guide descended from Christ and the apostles. John Ruskin (1819–1899) marked an epoch in art criticism in his *Modern Painters*, the first volume of which appeared anonymously in 1843. He began the work in defense of Turner; but in successive volumes he broadened the scope of his task to include a championship of modern painters in general, and to develop a philosophy of art. According to the view which he worked out, art is a true manifestation of the temper of the artist and a reflection of the spirit of his age. In the *Seven Lamps of Architecture*, Ruskin contributed greatly to stimulate a new Gothic revival. Toward the end of his life he turned toward questions of economic and social reform, problems into which he sought to infuse the breath of idealism. Gifted with an exquisite sense of beauty, with a consuming moral enthusiasm and a style of singular eloquence and richness, he performed, in spite of inconsistencies and occasional petulance, signal service in elevating artistic criticism from a mere question of professional technique, as well as in unlocking treasures hitherto hidden from the common man. Thus Carlyle, Arnold, Newman, and Ruskin were, each in his peculiar way, preachers to their generation.

Victorian Poets. Tennyson, Browning, and Swinburne. — Alfred Tennyson (1809–1892), the reigning poet of the Victorian Age, succeeded Wordsworth as poet laureate in 1850. He began to publish short lyrics as early as 1827; but it was years before he showed independence of his youthful models, Byron, Scott, and Moore, after which

he produced some pieces of striking individuality and rare beauty. Between 1847 and 1859 appeared the longer poems which established his reputation — *The Princess*, *In Memoriam*, *Maud*, and the *Idylls of the King*. Tennyson's distinctive merit is his perfection of form. Voicing the conventional thought and ideals of Victorian society, he was an upholder of well-ordered harmony against individual caprice, and whenever he approached the tragic, it was in a spirit of reposeful melancholy rather than of passionate revolt. His further limitations are his lack of dramatic fire, his elaboration of the obvious and commonplace, and his surfeit of "linked sweetness long drawn out." Almost more than any other poet, he has suffered from the defects of his qualities; since many of his most ineffective of beautiful poems are most popular. Robert Browning (1812–1889) was his opposite in almost every respect. Though he could write with simplicity and exquisite melody, he was, both in phrasing and in the structure of his verse, all too often crabbed and obscure. On the other hand, he had the dramatic genius which Tennyson lacked, and is without a rival among the poets in his ability for interpreting in verse the spirit of music and painting. A student of life in all its aspects, he showed an insatiable curiosity for probing into the farthest recesses of human motives and mastering the complexities of the mind and soul. Much in his writing that is difficult at first sight becomes clear to the patient reader, and almost invariably rewards serious effort. *Pauline*, his first poem, appeared in 1833; *Paracelsus* first attracted the attention of the discerning, while *Sordello* is the most inscrutable of his productions. Among his longer works are: *Pippa Passes*, *A Blot on the 'Scutcheon*, and *A Soul's Tragedy*, and his marvelous *The Ring and the Book*. In 1846 Browning married Elizabeth Barrett, the first woman poet of high distinction since Sappho. Algernon Charles Swinburne (1837–1909), a devotee of pagan beauty, showed, particularly in his earlier work, a temper of revolt against convention and propriety which shocked the majority of his contemporaries. None have excelled him in power of word music or in mastery of the varied forms of poetical technique, and, especially in *Atalanta in Calydon*, he showed a rare gift of reproducing the spirit of the Greek drama. However, notwithstanding a few signal achievements, the poetic drama in the Victorian Age never recovered the ascendancy which the novel had begun to usurp in the previous century.[1]

[1] The Pre-Raphaelite Movement, which began about 1848, was primarily artistic rather than literary in its inception, a protest against the conventionalism bound to result from the following of any master, even Raphael, the "prince of painters." Nevertheless, it owed much to Newman's revival of ecclesiastical

The Novelists. — Before Scott had closed his labors, two novelists had appeared on the scene, who, though they continued to write acceptable works for half a century, were soon overshadowed. Disraeli was the creator of the political novel. Beginning in 1826, with *Vivian Grey*, which made a sensation by its brilliancy and audacity, he concluded with *Endymion* in 1880, though *Coningsby* and *Sybil*, in which he attacked the social and political system of the dominant Whigs and advocated his peculiar system of Tory democracy, are perhaps his most important productions. Of little excellence as pure literature, his books furnish invaluable pictures of the public men and problems of his time. Edward Bulwer Lytton (1803–1873), later Baron Lytton, was an author of unusual versatility, who wrote society, philosophical, scientific, indeed, all sorts of novels and plays as well. While the *Last Days of Pompeii* and the *Last of the Barons* are among the most popular stories, *Pelham* and *My Novel* have more merit. The *Lady of Lyons* and *Richelieu* are still produced on the stage. Lord Lytton made the most of his great talents, but missed the goal which is only attained by genius and sincere conviction.

Dickens and Thackeray. — In 1836 appeared the *Sketches by Boz* and the first installment of *Pickwick Papers* by Charles Dickens (1812–1870). The long series of his novels which followed are familiar in every household, and probably have been more widely read than those of any other writer in the English-speaking world. The hardships of his early life which brought him in contact with the people, his early training as a journalist, and his love for the stage explain his power of appealing to the masses, his facility, and his dramatic instinct. During the past generation there has been a tendency to belittle his title to fame. His faults are patent enough to the critical reader: his humor is largely obvious and extravagant caricature, dwelling much on "external oddities," his pathos is often "shallow and overwrought"; his situations are frequently artificial and theatrical; he was wanting in penetration, and his characters are, as a rule, merely personified traits. On the other hand, he was a keen observer who could describe vividly what he saw and tell a story of absorbing interest. He had a genius for depicting the tragic and the terrible, his fun, in spite of all that has been said against it, is wholesome and captivating, and his characters live in the memory. Finally, and who would want to achieve more, his genial optimism has brought joy to millions of humankind. It has

and religious symbolism, and had an important influence in stimulating mystical romantic poetry of a medieval type. Dante Gabriel Rossetti, the guiding spirit of the "Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood," was a poet as well as an artist, and produced verses of haunting beauty, such as the *Blessed Damozel*.

been said that Dickens brought good out of evil, and that Thackeray brought evil out of good. Though this is hardly fair to Thackeray, the two great masters were in striking contrast. William Makepeace Thackeray (1811–1863) who began by picturing unscrupulous adventurers, later selected his scenes and characters from high life or from the upper middle classes. Caring little for external nature, he was strong in the analysis and portrayal of character, dwelling on the faults and weaknesses of society and of individuals; but, if he was cynical on the surface, he was a generous-minded, big-hearted man, who defined humor as " wit tempered with love," who could appreciate noble traits, and show a wealth of pity and tolerance for even the least edifying of those whom he felt called upon to depict. Less widely popular than Dickens, he has always made a stronger appeal to the thinking reader. Besides his inimitable satiric pictures of a life in his own day, he produced in *Henry Esmond* one of the greatest historical novels in the English language; he drew a racy sketch of the four Georges, and, in his *English Humourists*, he has made the literary world of the eighteenth century live again before our eyes.

Brontë and Eliot. — Charlotte Brontë (1816–1855), the most famous of three gifted sisters, is chiefly known for *Jane Eyre*, a novel of intense power and passion, but characterized by unrealities of detail due to her limited experience of life. Mary Ann Evans (1819–1880), who wrote under the name of George Eliot, was a woman of wide knowledge both of life and books. In her first novels she reproduced, with graphic fidelity, the scenes and folk of her own countryside, and enlivened her serious problems with touches of fine humor. As her work progressed, she overdeveloped her inclination for psychological analysis. *Adam Bede*, the *Mill on the Floss*, and *Silas Marner* show her at her best, yet, even in these early productions, she keeps in the foreground her great lesson that dire consequences attend the disregard of the moral order.

Minor Novelists. — Among numbers of minor novelists some have produced work well worth reading by subsequent generations. Charles Lever wrote rollicking tales of Irish and military life during the era of the Napoleonic wars. Captain Marryat, a naval officer, produced after his retirement from active service, in 1830, a series of breezy sea stories which are not only entertaining, but valuable as a reflection of the author's actual experiences. Charles Kingsley was a many-sided man, among other things a Christian socialist and an exponent of muscular Christianity, who began by writing on contemporary problems, turning later to history and historical fiction. *Westward Ho*, a glorification of the Elizabethan seamen, is perhaps his best novel, while his

Water Babies is one of the most famous children's stories in the language. Charles Reade started as a dramatist, but came to devote most of his energies to stories exposing social abuses. The *Cloister and the Hearth*, in which he ventured into historical fiction, ranks as a masterpiece. Mrs. Gaskell, in *Mary Barton* and other works, took up the cause of the poor in the manufacturing districts, but, from the literary standpoint, is remembered chiefly for *Cranford*, an exquisite picture of life in a secluded English village. Anthony Trollope was amazingly industrious and businesslike, reproducing what he saw with the fidelity of a photographer and with almost equal absence of imagination; but his realistic descriptions of the clerical life in the cathedral city of "Barchester" are, in their way, distinct achievements. Wilkie Collins still retains a hold on the lovers of weirdness and mystery. A period which could produce Dickens, Thackeray, George Eliot, to say nothing of such a long list of writers of second rank, has certainly been supreme in the age of the novel.

Later Victorian Novelists. — While it is too early to estimate the importance of most recent novelists, three stand out sufficiently to merit attention. George Meredith (1828–1909) published the *Ordeal of Richard Feverel*, one of his best-known novels, as early as 1859, the same year in which *Adam Bede* saw the light: yet he should be grouped with the later generation, for he outlived his contemporaries, and, owing to his obscurity and his daring manner of portraying life, he received only belated recognition. It is true that he was incapable of constructing an absorbing coherent plot, and his style is often as perversely difficult as that of Browning; while this latter fault was due in some degree to the complex and baffling human problems with which he chose to deal, it prevented him from making the universal appeal reserved for supreme geniuses. On the other hand, few Englishmen have equaled him in epigrammatic power; he had a wonderful gift for subtle analysis; he described nature lovingly and superbly; he delineated the life of the English upper classes with fascinating skill, and, at the same time, equaled Shakespeare and George Eliot in his faculty for creating peasants who could talk in their own tongue. Thomas Hardy (born 1840) resembles Meredith in his love of nature, and he has reproduced with artistic fidelity the scenes and peoples of his native Wessex; but his conviction that the irony of circumstance makes sport with human endeavor most often renders him harrowing to read. Robert Louis Stevenson (1850–1894), handicapped during much of his life by a malady which killed him prematurely, showed himself a prince of story tellers and narrated his entrancing tales in a

style of exquisite if rather overconscious art. He may prove, as some have prophesied, the herald of a new romanticism.[1]

Philosophy. — Among the many philosophical thinkers of the Victorian Era two are perhaps most important from the historical standpoint — John Stuart Mill (1806–1873) and Herbert Spencer (1820–1903). Mill, who had a soul above the mechanical training given him by his father, was active in many fields. He was the last and greatest economist of the "orthodox" school which developed from Adam Smith, and his *Principles of Political Economy* long remained the standard work on the subject; he wrote a suggestive essay *On Liberty*, in which he sought to solve the problem of the relation between the individual and the laws of Society and the State; he was a pioneer in the movement for the enfranchisement of women; and was an interpreter of positivism [2] and the science of sociology, both of which originated with the Frenchman Auguste Comte (1798–1867). In his *Logic*, Mill marked the greatest advance since Bacon, providing, what Bacon did not, a philosophical method for scientific reasoning; in other words, he taught — what was peculiarly valuable in an age of scientific discovery — the method of generalizing from the facts and then verifying by deduction from known laws. Spencer published, in 1855, his *Principles of Psychology*, based upon the evolutionary standpoint, a very notable fact, since the book appeared four years before Darwin's *Origin of Species*. In 1860 he issued the prospectus of his *System of Synthetic Philosophy*, "in which, beginning with the first principles of knowledge, he proposed to trace the progress of evolution in life, mind, society and morality." This he did in a long series of volumes, starting with *First Principles* in 1862. His great service was to introduce the principle of evolution into the varied subjects with which he dealt, and — though here he was not completely successful — to investigate the laws which underlie life and thought, and then group them into a synthetic or unified form.

Historical Scholarship. — This period marks an amazing advance in historical method and research, though Thomas Buckle failed in his effort to construct a philosophy of the subject. *The History of Greece* by George Grote is a monument of learning, which, notwithstanding bias in favor of Athenian democracy and the fact that it has been super-

[1] Richard Blackmore (1825–1900) in *Lorna Doone* and Joseph Henry Shorthouse (1834–1903) in *John Inglesant* have each created a work of enduring merit. Rudyard Kipling (born 1865) has produced verse of striking force and originality, with a strong Imperialistic bent, and has written tales which throw a flood of light on India and the Anglo-Indian military and civil life.

[2] The positivist philosophy devotes itself to a description of scientific phenomena.

seded in parts by more recent investigations, still remains a classic. Most notable, however, has been the progress in the study of English history, especially in the early period. The enthusiasm for freedom, manifested in and stimulated by the Reform Bill, led to a new interest in the Anglo-Saxon period — regarded as a golden age of liberty which Norman absolutism destroyed. While others preceded him, the first significant pioneer work was John Kemble's *The Saxons in England*, 1849. Meantime, scholars had begun to edit and print the original sources and, before long, a body of materials became available which challenge comparison with those of any other country in Europe. Among those who have written on the subject, only the most prominent names can be mentioned — Freeman, Stubbs, Maine, Pollock, and Maitland in the medieval, and Froude, Gardiner, Lecky, and Walpole in the modern period.

Darwinism. — In science and practical applications "the advance made during the reign of Queen Victoria has been greater in many ways than the advance made from the beginning of civilization to that time." Among the landmarks of progress three stand out preëminent — the establishment of the doctrine of evolution; the extension of the use of steam, particularly in transportation; and the applications of electricity. The former has fundamentally transformed man's whole attitude toward the origin and growth of life. Evolutionary as distinguished from creationist philosophy is as old as the Greeks, while biological evolution, in the general sense of the descent of one species from another, was by no means a new idea, but it was only the long and patient experimental studies by Charles Darwin (1809–1882) which placed it on a sound scientific basis and resulted in its final acceptance. He made clear the causes of biological evolution by showing that different species of plants and animals, "instead of being each separately created," are evolved from lower types by means of "natural selection" in the struggle for existence; in other words, there is a "survival of the fittest" [1] due to a process of continuous adaptation. Darwin began his special investigations in 1837, which were first completely set forth in his *Origin of Species* in 1859.[2] His views were bitterly

[1] This term was coined by Herbert Spencer and adopted by Darwin, who used it interchangeably with "natural selection."

[2] During the previous year Alfred Russel Wallace sent a paper from the Malay Islands anticipating the results to which Darwin had been working for so many years. Happily, both men thought more of the advancement of human knowledge than self-glorification, so Darwin published a preliminary paper, together with Wallace's, and the latter got credit to the full extent of his contribution. Darwin, however, had started first, and had based his findings on an incomparably wider and more thorough research.

opposed by the more conservative scientists, and by those who fancied that their theological beliefs were endangered by the conflict between the theory of evolution and the Biblical story of the Creation as popularly understood. Gradually, however, the substance of the Darwinian doctrine has won its way to general acceptance, though certain features of it, such as the inheritance of acquired characteristics, have been modified by later investigators. The final victory was due, in a considerable degree, to the championship of Thomas Huxley, who combined, to an unusual extent, the faculty for original research with the gift of popular exposition.

Progress in Other Sciences. — Not only did the period witness signal progress in most of the older sciences — geology, for example, threw much new light on the antiquity of the earth and of plant and animal life — but many newer ones, such as paleontology and anthropology, were marked off as distinct fields of investigation. Notable gains were made in medicine and surgery, chiefly through the discovery of anesthesia, the germ theory of disease, and antiseptic surgery. Ether was an American discovery, but shortly afterwards, in 1847, a Scot, (later Sir) James Y. Simpson, brought chloroform into use. John Tyndall, a natural philosopher who devoted much attention to physics, and who exercised an even wider influence than Huxley in the popularization of science, was a pioneer in the germ theory of infection and in recognizing the value of sterilization. Dr. Joseph Lister (later Lord Lister) did wonders in reducing the fatality of surgical operations by the introduction of antiseptic bandaging. Physics and chemistry made amazing strides, both in pure science and in practical applications. Among the latter, the invention of photography has an important place; for it has become an indispensable ally to investigators in the most diverse fields from astronomy to history. The Frenchman Daguerre first perfected, in 1839, the process of obtaining pictures through the chemical action of sunlight on a metallic plate; but the daguerreotype was soon superseded by the modern photography, in which William Talbot led the way. His process of taking impressions on sensitized paper has in turn been improved upon by the use of the dry plate.

Electricity. — The discovery by an Italian, Alessandro Volta, of the voltaic pile, in 1800, followed by his cell, first provided the battery for producing continuous supplies of electricity, and the applications which followed have had an incalculable effect on modern civilization. Michael Faraday (1791–1867), who has been described as the "prince of investigators," did so much for pure and applied science that only a special treatise could do him justice. Most significant in connection

with the present subject was his work on magnetic induction, which prepared the way for the dynamo — the machine now employed for generating electricity in large quantities. His discovery of benzene, in 1825, has led to important commercial results, especially in the preparation of aniline dyes. William Thomson (1824–1907), later Lord Kelvin, was a remarkable combination of pure scientist and inventor, whose investigations extended over the field of mathematics, heat, electricity and magnetism.

Electrical Inventions and Appliances. — As practical realities, all the epoch-making electrical inventions and appliances date from the Victorian Era. The first attempt to construct an electric telegraph was made by one Lesage in 1774; but it was more than half a century before a series of lines was actually in operation, and not till 1844 that the first public system in England was installed — soon superseded by the system of the American, Morse, first employed on a line of wires running from Washington to Baltimore. Meantime, experiments in submarine telegraphy had been made, and a line between Dover and Calais was established in 1851. The first attempt to lay an Atlantic cable was made six years later; after two successive failures, in 1858 and 1865, the momentous task was finally achieved in 1866, for which infinite credit is due to Cyrus Field in securing finances, and to the scientific genius of Lord Kelvin.[1] As the result of a long series of experiments, arc-lights were first made to work successfully in 1849, though Sir Humphry Davy had discovered the voltaic arc years before. The incandescent lamp, which traces its beginnings to a process devised about 1841 by an Englishman, De Moleyns, only came to be generally employed toward the end of the last century. With the perfecting of the dynamo, within the recent generation, electricity has taken possession of the field as a motive force, and as a means of communication and illumination, while it bids fair to supersede steam for purposes of transportation on railways.

Steam Railways and Navigation. — The development of railways in Great Britain since the opening of the Manchester and Liverpool railway, in 1830, has been enormous, the tremendous significance of which can only be realized in view of the numbers of men employed for the manufacture of all the vast equipment which goes to make up a railroad, in the structure of the car shops, in the mines for supplying the materials for fuel; in view of the increased facilities for emigration

[1] The telephone was due chiefly to American enterprise, while the perfection of wireless telegraphy has been the signal achievement of the Italian Marconi, who began his experiments in 1895, and, in 1899, first succeeded in sending messages across the Channel from Boulogne to Dover.

and for carrying laborers to and fro; and in view of the creation of new markets and the possibilities of transporting food supplies. The development of steam navigation is equally striking. In 1819 the first steamship crossed the Atlantic from Savannah to Liverpool, and, going partly under sail, occupied thirty-two days. It was not till 1838 that the whole distance was covered under steam, when the time was cut to fifteen. Now the fastest steamers have made a record of less than five, exclusive of the delays in entering and leaving port. Originally the ships were side-wheelers built of wood; the first iron steamship was built in 1821 and the first iron screw propeller in 1838; but screw propellers and iron construction were not generally adopted till the early sixties. Iron gave place to steel about twenty years later. The invention of the compound and then of the triple-expansion engine made it possible to build both larger and swifter vessels, which, added to the employment of artificial refrigeration and cold storage, has increased greatly the comfort of travel. Nowadays sailing ships are little used except for slow coasting trade, and the effect of steam navigation in supplying food and raw materials, opening new markets, stimulating emigration and industry, as well as in consolidating the British Empire, has been almost incalculable.[1]

Agricultural Progress. — The period of agricultural distress following the Napoleonic War continued for some years. When prices dropped, the cultivation of poor land ceased to be profitable, consequently landlords who had mortgaged their estates to extend their farming operations went under, together with tenants working on borrowed capital. Naturally, a further result was misery and discontent on the part of the agricultural laborers. However, shortly before Victoria's accession, conditions began to improve, and, with brief intervals of depression, the improvement continued until about 1876. This renewed prosperity was due to a combination of many causes. For one thing, the revival and growth of manufactures, following the temporary slump during the first years of the peace, created a new demand for food supplies and enhanced their price; then the Poor Law of 1834 lifted a great burden from the rural taxpayer, while railways and steam navigation made possible the transportation of perishable products and made new markets accessible. At the same time, the

[1] During the first half of the century, British naval constructors lagged behind the merchant marine in the introduction of improvements. Since then they have forged steadily to the front in iron and steel construction for hulls, in the introduction of armor-plate, in the introduction of breech-loading guns worked by machinery, and in the employment of torpedoes, torpedo boats, and submarines, so that, on the eve of the World War, the British fleet was not only nearly double that of any other afloat but was well abreast of the times in modern equipment.

establishment of joint stock banks provided capital for improvements in which science came to the aid of practice. Chemical and geological knowledge was applied in the treatment of the soil, and artificially prepared fertilizers were adopted with excellent results. Improved methods of draining proved a special boon to farmers in the clay soil districts, where lands had been under water during the rainy season and hard-baked during times of drought. Intensive farming, which aimed to get the greatest amount out of land already under cultivation, began to take the place of extensive tillage, which consisted in merely extending the area to be worked. The ambition of wealthy manufacturers and merchants to become landed proprietors had the two-fold effect of bringing much capital into agriculture and of raising the price of land. Finally, in this period, great improvements were made in agricultural machinery, when new types of plows, harrows, cultivators as well as mowing machines and steam threshing machines came to be employed.

Decline in Agriculture. — The repeal of the Corn Laws, in 1846, ushered in a brief interval of depression, due partly to an influx of cheap food, partly to the breaking of the monopoly, and, more especially, to the fear of the British farmer that he could not compete with the over-sea producers. Conditions, however, soon righted themselves. The laborer was helped by the migration, following upon the potato famine, of large numbers of Irishmen who had hitherto come to England during the harvest season and had brought down wages by their competition. On the other hand, the influx of money from the discovery of gold in California (1848) and in Australia (1850–1851) raised prices and thus aided the landlord and tenant farmer. The third quarter of the century was, on the whole, perhaps the most prosperous period in the annals of British agriculture. About 1876 came a new decline from which the farmer has never recovered. A chief cause was the increasing competition from overseas, due to the development of the steamship and the invention of refrigerating processes, which has made it possible to convey meat in cold storage from the extreme ends of the world. For a time these foodstuffs were absorbed by the growing population; but a bad harvest in 1875, followed by a worse one in the "Black Year," 1879, led to extra heavy imports of corn and wheat from abroad, to the withdrawal of much land from tillage, and to a consequent rural exodus. Of late, efforts have been made to bring the laborer back to the soil. In 1875 a bill was passed to arrange for compensation to agricultural tenants for unexhausted improvements. Then, from 1882 to 1890, a series of allotment Acts were passed to enable the local authorities to acquire lands to rent in small parcels. This

was followed, in 1892, by the Small Holdings Act, empowering County Councils to obtain lands and advance sums of money to those who desired to purchase holdings of fifty acres or under. But none of these measures proved effective; for in fifteen years not more than 850 acres were sold. A new Small Holdings and Allotments Act of 1907, authorizing the County Councils to take lands at the current price with or without the consent of the large owners, has proved more successful, and within three years nearly 100,000 acres were allotted to small cultivators. At present, plans are under discussion to improve the housing conditions of the agricultural laborer, to raise his wages, to secure deserving tenants against eviction, and to increase still further the number of peasant proprietors. In view, however, of the experience of the eighteenth century and the increasing competition from abroad, it is doubtful whether the small farmer could maintain himself.

Decorative Art. — Fertile as was the Victorian age in science and invention, it was, in the early period at least, barren of anything except bad taste in decorative art. Mansard roof houses, furnished with glaring carpets, ghastly marble statuary, and ornately carved black walnut are unlovely monuments of this period of philistine ugliness. Those who strove for better things were for years as voices crying in the wilderness. About the middle of the century Ruskin began to preach the gospel of a revival of Gothic art and ornament. The Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood, not long after its foundation, extended its scope to include architecture, costume and household decoration as well as painting and literature. Toward the end of its short life it became an "æsthetic affectation," making for itself a sort "of religion out of wall paper, old teapots and fans"; but it began as a healthy plea for simplicity and beauty against conventional unsightliness and set standards, which survived its own organization. Much was due to William Morris (1834–1896), one of the Brotherhood, and perhaps the most versatile man with brain and hand of any of the century. He painted pictures, he produced large quantities of excellent prose and verse, he went in for printing and bookbinding, and, in 1860, he started a firm for supplying stained glass, tapestries, carpets, and household furniture. Everything was designed by men of artistic instinct and training, and, so far as possible, fashioned by hand. This wholesome revival of the traditions of the medieval arts and crafts has had an immense influence. Artistic taste has continued to improve, although an inevitable obstacle to its general diffusion has been the necessity for cheap machine-made goods.

Painting and Music. — The Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood was founded by John Everett Millais and Holman Hunt, though D. G.

Rossetti became the great spiritual influence, and Edward Burne-Jones was a famous member. During the five years of its organized activity it formed the nearest to a school of painting that England has ever had. Outside the Brotherhood there are many names that might be mentioned; for example, George Frederick Watts, who, during the course of his long life, painted superb portraits of most of the celebrated Englishmen of his time. While it is too early to estimate, the general opinion is that the greatest artists since Constable and Turner have been D. G. Rossetti, Millais and James McNeill Whistler, an American who spent his later life in London. Owing to the influence of Handel, the oratorio has been the form of musical composition which has since appealed most to the mass of Englishmen. And if we except Michael Balfe (1808–1870) whose *Bohemian Girl* has enjoyed a long and general popularity, the uniquely excellent comic operas of Gilbert and Sullivan, and the fine compositions of Sir Edward Elgar (born 1857), the British have contributed practically nothing in the way of operatic or orchestral productions.

Industrial and Social Progress. — Two striking facts in the material progress of Britain during the period since the first Reform Bill are the increase of population and the increase of wealth. The number of inhabitants of the United Kingdom has increased from 24,392,485 to 45,365,599, while the total wealth of the country, estimated on the basis of income, has swelled, during the interval, from about £225,000,000 to £2,140,000,000. In other words, wealth has increased about four times as fast as the population. Unhappily, however, this increase has been most unevenly distributed. From the beginning of the century to 1842 there was a startling growth of poverty and crime, then came a striking change for the better. Curiously enough, machinery was to a large degree responsible, both for the wretchedness and for the prosperity which followed it. Other factors were the repeal of the Corn Laws, which steadied and cheapened the price of food; the legislation regulating conditions of employment, especially in the case of women and children; and the improvement of sanitary conditions in the populous towns. Although conditions are still deplorable enough, the English laborer, what with better housing, better lighting, better industrial regulations, and better wages, is far better off than his fathers before him. Friendly societies, trade-unions, coöperative stores and banks, and building societies are at once indications of and further aids to thrift and progress. At the same time, the growing consumption of meat, tea, sugar and tobacco indicates a rising standard of comfort. This, together with a steady upward movement of prices, especially during the last decade, has resulted in the acute

problem that the incomes of large numbers of the working classes have ceased to be sufficient to meet their expenditures. Hence a serious agitation has developed to secure a minimum wage. However, the chief exploitation and suffering exists among the unskilled, for the skilled labor, by virtue of increasingly fine organization, has made comparatively good terms for itself; but of late, particularly since the War, there has been a growing demand for a basic reconstruction of the whole relation of labor to capital.

Evidences of Progress. — In spite of the present crisis, and in spite of panics and unrest, strikes and chronic unemployment, a survey of the period, as a whole, shows encouraging evidences of progress. Old privileges of the favored and disabilities of the unfavored classes have been removed one by one: abolition of sinecures, cessation of compulsory Church rates, disestablishment of the Irish Church, and destruction of the monopoly of the East India Company are among the examples of the former, while concessions to the Roman Catholics, Nonconformists and aliens are instances of the latter. Although there are still acute differences between labor and capital, the breaking down of the aristocratic barriers has tended to bring the classes closer together; philanthropy has become more general, and educational and social settlements have been established in the crowded quarters of large cities. The temperance revival of Father Mathew (1790–1856), while mainly concentrated in Ireland, was not without effect in England, while cheaper tea has contributed, at least in some degree, to check the excessive use of alcohol. The establishment of a system of public education, the introduction of cheap light in the form of petroleum, gas, and electricity, and the spread of the newspaper — not an unmixed blessing — have done much to develop a more intelligent and happy body of citizens.

Improvement of Prison Conditions. — The increase of humanitarianism may be seen in all directions, in the abolition of the slave trade and slavery, the prohibition of flogging in the army and navy, the discontinuance of the press gang, the suppression of transportation, the protection of dumb animals, and the improved treatment of debtors and convicts. At the beginning of the century, in spite of the efforts of Howard, prison conditions were still frightful. Yet he had not labored in vain, for his work was taken up by Elizabeth Fry and by other worthy persons. As a result of the organized work of the Society for the Improvement of Prison Discipline which they founded, the Gaol Acts of 1823–1824 were passed, providing for improved sanitation and cleanliness, and individual cots or hammocks for prisoners. Also, regular labor, prison chaplains and schoolmasters as well as

matrons for the women were recommended. Following a parliamentary report of 1835 the principle was established of separate cells in place of the old practice of herding debtors, hardened criminals and even lunatics promiscuously together. More recently, the custom has been adopted of short terms of solitary confinement, followed by penal servitude or associated labor on public works; followed again by release on ticket of leave or probation. Notwithstanding the increase of population, the convictions for crime have been decreased from 19,927 in 1840 to 11,987 in 1910.

Condition of Women. — Although much remains to be done, the lot of women has greatly improved since the beginning of the century. Within the memory of those yet living, the education of girls was largely in the hands of governesses and private schools, with the emphasis on deportment, music, and other accomplishments. Memory was trained at the expense of the reasoning faculties, and teaching was given out of "elegant abridgements." Since the middle of the century, however, their instruction has approximated to that of boys, and higher education has been opened to them. In 1867 women were admitted to examinations at the University of London, in 1881 at Cambridge, and in 1884 at Oxford, while colleges for women have been founded at both the ancient Universities. In 1837, the Ladies' Gallery was opened in the new House of Commons. Six years before, the first petition for votes for women was introduced, and, in 1867, John Stuart Mill made a strong plea for giving them the privilege. Soon after, the National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies was founded, and during the next forty-five years, some seven bills were introduced — which got as far as the second reading — for extending the vote, usually to widows and spinsters. About 1905 a militant agitation developed, led chiefly by Mrs. Pankhurst and her daughters. Their excesses had the effect of alienating many who might have been won over by more rational methods, but the splendid patriotism of women in the War has resulted in securing them a somewhat restricted suffrage.

Recent Labor Legislation. — Since the Reform Bill of 1867 there has been a marked increase in labor legislation. This includes an Act of 1878 simplifying, systematizing and extending all the factory legislation of the century, and an Act of 1901 which replaced it, and which is still in force.[1] More striking, perhaps, are the recent measures providing for social insurance. Bismarck initiated this policy in Germany, between 1881 and 1891, as a supplement to coercion in checking social unrest, and, in one form or another, it has since been adopted by

[1] It includes also a series of Acts relating to mines and collieries, passed at intervals between 1872 and 1906.

the leading Continental countries. In England the Liberal party, which came to power in December, 1905, has taken notable steps in the same direction. These have been embodied mainly in three great measures — The Workingmen's Compensation Act, 1906; the Old Age Pension Act, 1909; and the National Insurance Act, 1911. Formerly employees or workmen could, in case of accident, only recover damages by lawsuit — a long and costly process — and they had to prove too that the employer was directly responsible. Beginning in 1880 a series of Acts were passed shifting the burden of proof on the employer. The first of the series applied only to specified dangerous trades; but the Act of 1906 renders the employer liable for compensation — except in cases of "serious and wilful misconduct" — to all manual laborers, and practically all other employees, including domestic servants, who receive a salary of less than £250 a year.

Old Age Pensions and Insurance against Sickness and Unemployment. — The Old Age Pension Law of 1909 — an outcome of nearly thirty years of struggle — provides that every person, male or female, over seventy years of age, who has been a subject for twenty years and a resident of Great Britain for twelve, shall receive a pension, provided his or her income is less than £31 10*s.*; even paupers are included, though, as soon as the pension begins, poor relief ceases. Strictly speaking it is not an insurance scheme, since the recipients contribute nothing. The Act of 1911 has a twofold aim: "to provide for Insurance against loss of Health and for the Prevention and Cure of Sickness, and for Insurance against Unemployment." By the terms of the first part, all wage earners between sixteen and sixty-five who have less than £26 annual income from property are obliged to insure against sickness. Under the supervision of Government insurance commissioners, the scheme is administered through "approved societies," either existing Friendly Societies [1] or new bodies specially created. The funds are subscribed partly by the workers, partly by the employers and partly by the State — though, if the wage of the former is below a certain minimum, his quota falls on the employer — and the benefits include weekly payments during sickness, free medical attendance, and free treatment at hospitals to be supplied by the State. The second part of the Act is in the nature of an experiment for meeting the problem of chronic unemployment.[2] So far, it applies only to two trades —

[1] These are voluntary benefit or "mutual assurance" societies, some of which date back at least to the eighteenth century, and may possibly even trace their descent to the medieval gilds.

[2] Something had already been accomplished by the Labor Exchange Act of 1909, according to which England was divided into eleven districts, each including a

the building and the engineering — which include nearly 2,500,000 out of a total of 15,000,000 workmen. As in the case of the sickness insurance, the employees, the employers, and the State all contribute; the benefit is limited to a maximum of fifteen weeks, and is withheld in case the unemployment is due to misconduct, to strikes or lockouts. These socialistic features of the Liberal program were due mainly to Mr. Lloyd George — who became Chancellor of the Exchequer in 1908 — and are being watched with great interest.

The Coöperative Movement. Trade-Unionism. — The coöperative movement in England, of which Robert Owen was the practical founder, started as an effort to check the evils of competition. His ideas, first of a benevolent coöperation between employers and workmen and then of State organized communities in which the employer had no place, came to nothing; but an indirect result, not contemplated by him, was the organization of coöperative shops. The first to achieve practical success was started at Rochdale in 1844. Since then many other ventures have been undertaken. While attempts at coöperative production have been, generally speaking, failures, coöperative shops for distribution have had a considerable if not sensational success, and, in course of time, their members formed a national organization and began to hold annual congresses and to go into the wholesale business. The trade-unions of various trades began to hold annual congresses in 1870 — before Acts of 1871,[1] 1875 and 1876 gave them legal status. In 1899 a General Federation of Trade-Unions, affiliated with kindred organizations on the Continent, was created "to supplement the activities of the Trade-Union Congress." Although, in 1901, in the famous Taff Vale Case, the House of Lords struck a blow at trade-unionism, by a decision "that the members of the trade-union are liable singly and collectively for acts committed under the auspices of the Union," this decision was offset to a large degree by the Trades Dispute Act of 1906 — to which the Peers gave a

number of labor exchanges, which serve to bring employers and laborers together, and, if necessary, advance money to pay the latter's traveling expenses to the place where work is offered him.

[1] In 1867, as a consequence of outrages committed against workmen in Sheffield, and to a less degree in Manchester, a Royal Commission was appointed to investigate the whole subject of the Trade-Unions, held to be responsible. It was shown that they labored under serious disabilities. Some of the judges, at least, were of the opinion that any combination to raise wages was a "conspiracy and a misdemeanor" at common law. Hence the discontent of the Unions; but it was found that, while one murder and many cases of intimidation could be traced to their members, only twelve unions out of sixty in Sheffield, and only one in Manchester were involved. So, by the Trade-Union Act of 1871, their legality was formally recognized.

reluctant assent — protecting the funds of trade-unions. By the Osborne Judgment of 1909 the Lords decided that it was illegal to employ moneys raised by compulsory contributions to pay the salaries of the members representing them in Parliament. This, again, has been offset by a measure of 1911 providing for the payment of all members of the House of Commons at £400 a year.

Laborite Political Parties. — Meantime, labor had sought to reinforce the work of the trade-unions by organizing into political parties. Two labor candidates stood for Parliament in 1868, and, six years later, when the number had risen to thirteen, two were elected. In 1893 the Independent Labor Party was organized for the purpose, not only of demanding State intervention in the interests of labor — for procuring an eight-hour day for example — but with the avowed socialistic aim of establishing "collective ownership and control of the means of production, distribution and exchange." Since these views proved too radical for the rank and file of the British workmen the Trade-Union Congress, in 1899, took steps which resulted in the organization of a group in the Commons prepared "to coöperate with any party which for the time being may be engaged in promoting legislation in the direct interest of labor." In 1906 this organization took the name of the Labor Party, and succeeded in electing twenty-nine out of fifty-one candidates, whereas the Independent Laborites elected seven. Although the number of labor representatives has since declined somewhat, the Liberal party depends upon them, together with the Irish Nationalists, for a majority.

Socialism. — English socialism was for a long time identified with Robert Owen, who enunciated his views nearly twenty years before the word was coined in 1835. His work, however, had no direct result, and the system owes its development to Continental thinkers. About the middle of the century, however, a school of Christian Socialists was founded in England by Charles Kingsley, Thomas Hughes and others as a protest against the prevailing *laissez-faire*. While Christian Socialism, as a formal movement, had a short life, it planted seeds which have never died. In 1864 an International Workingmen's Association was formed in London by the combined efforts of British trades unionists and Continental refugees. But, as a whole, however, the British workmen have never been socialists, though the depressions from 1875 to 1880 had the effect of accentuating socialistic tendencies, of developing a new unionism more aggressive and less individualistic than the old. The Democratic Federation, dating from 1881, and its reconstitution two years later, under the name Social Democratic Federation, marks the modern stage. Yet

neither the Federation, nor the Social Democratic party which it formed, has been very successful, and both have, to a large degree, been forced to act with the non-socialistic laborites. Recently, however, syndicalism — a revolutionary trade-unionism originating in France about 1906, and aiming to control production and distribution — has been a force in general strikes. The Fabian Society, founded in 1883, consists of educated men, including many liberals, who hold moderate theoretical socialistic views, and directs its appeal mainly to the upper and middle classes. While out-and-out socialism has made little headway, socialistic principles have gained increasingly even in the Conservative and Liberal parties, and have shown their strength in the legislation outlined above, undertaken by the latter party since 1906.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

General Conditions. Traill, *Social England*, VI, to 1885. J. Ashton, *When William IV was King* (1896). Brodrick and Fotheringham, ch. XX. Low and Sanders, ch. XX. Walpole, *History of England*, III, ch. XII; IV, ch. XVII; VI, conclusion. *History of Twenty-five Years*, I, ch. I.

Constitutional and Legal. May, *Constitutional History*. Maitland, *Constitutional History*, period IV, an excellent brief survey. D. J. Medley, *Manual of English Constitutional History*, a valuable work of reference, not chronological. E. Jenks, *Short History of the English Law* (1912), especially period IV. Sir R. W. Anson, *Law and Custom of the Constitution* (3 vols. 3d ed., 1907). A. V. Dicey, *Law and Public Opinion* (8th ed., 1915), very suggestive. W. Bagehot, *The English Constitution* (2d ed., 1872). S. Low, *The Governance of England* (1904). L. Courtney, *The Working Constitution of the United Kingdom* (1901). T. F. Moran, *The Theory and Practice of the English Government* (1908). D. D. Wallace, *The Government of England* (1917). The three latter are good brief accounts. A. L. Lowell, *The Government of England* (2 vols., 1910), the standard work on the subject.

Social and Industrial. Usher, *Industrial History* (bibliography following text, XIV–XVII). Porter's *Progress of the Nation* (ed. F. W. Hirst, 1912). McCulloch, *Dictionary of Commerce and Commercial Navigation* (1860–1872). R. H. Palgrave, *Dictionary of Political Economy* (1894–99). T. Mackay, *History of the English Poor Law* (1904). S. and B. Webb's *Trade Unions* (1894, rev. ed. 1919) and *Industrial Democracy* (1897). G. J. Holyoake's *History of Co-operation* (2 vols., rev. ed. 1906). J. F. Wilkinson, *The Friendly Society Movement* (1891). Sir E. W. Brabrook, *Provident Societies and Industrial Welfare* (1898). Sir E. F. Du Cane, *The Punishment and Prevention of Crime* (1885). F. A. Ogg, *Social Progress in Contemporary Europe* (1912), which contains much on England, is an excellent compendium. C. Hayes, *British Social Politics* (1913), valuable for legislation since 1906. Percy Alden, *Democratic England* (1912). G. H. Perris, *Indus-*

trial History of Modern England (1914). A. E. Metcalfe, *Woman's Effort* (1917), "a chronicle of British women's fifty years struggle for citizenship." See also *Cambridge Modern History*, XII, ch. XXIII (bibliography 957–966). R. E. Prothero, *English Farming Past and Present* (1913). S. Smiles, *Lives of George and Robert Stephenson* (1868). Acworth, *The Railways of England* (1900).

Science and Literature. G. J. Romanes, *Darwin and After Darwin* (1892–7). F. Darwin ed., *Life and Letters of Charles Darwin* (3 vols., 1887). O. Lodge, *Pioneers of Science* (1893). A. R. Wallace, *The Wonderful Century* (1898). R. Garnett, *Heroes of Science* (1885). G. P. Gooch, *History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century* (1913). *Cambridge Modern History*, XI, ch. XIII (bibliography 934–936), XII, ch. XXVI (bibliography 972–976). Moody and Lovett, *English Literature*. Taine, *English Literature*. McCarthy, *Our Own Times*, II, ch. XXIX, IV, ch. LXVII. E. C. Stedman, *Victorian Poets* (1903). Mrs. Oliphant, *A Literary History of England in the Nineteenth Century* (1882). W. L. Cross, *The Development of the English Novel* (1911). J. A. Buckley and W. T. Williams, *A Guide to British Historical Fiction* (1912). For further references on the novel see Moody and Lovett, 451. For literature in general see ch. XLIX above.

The Church. Wakeman, ch. XX. F. W. Cornish, *The History of the English Church* (pts. I and II, 1910). Walpole, *History of England*, V, XXI; *History of Twenty-five Years*, IV, XIX. Newman, *Apologia pro Vita Sua* (1864–5), frequently reprinted. R. W. Church, *The Oxford Movement* (1891). W. Ward, *William George Ward and the Catholic Revival* (1893). B. Ward, *The Sequel to Catholic Emancipation, 1820–1850* (2 vols., 1915). S. L. Ollard, *A Short History of the Oxford Movement* (1915). P. H. Brown, *Scotland*, III. W. L. Mathieson, *Church and Reform in Scotland, 1797–1843* (1918). H. J. Laski, *Studies in the Problems of Sovereignty* (1917), relates to the Oxford and Free Kirk movements. For further references see Low and Sanders, 506–507.

CHAPTER LVI

SKETCH OF THE REIGN OF EDWARD VII (1901–1910) AND OF THE EARLY YEARS OF GEORGE V (1910–1914)

Edward VII. Accession and Character. — Albert Edward, who, in his sixtieth year, ascended the throne as Edward VII, 22 January, 1901, was a man of unusual social gifts and worldly experience, genial, tactful and fond of seeking acquaintances from the most diverse walks of life, though he was punctilious in matters of ceremony on state occasions. He spent short terms at various universities; but the rigid training to which his parents subjected him disinclined him for serious study; books made little appeal to him, and in later life he rarely read anything but the newspapers. Furthermore, he was a patron of sport, particularly of the turf, he was an enthusiastic supporter of the theater and the opera, as well as the leader of fashion in London; indeed his love of pleasure and his bohemian tastes aroused serious criticism at times on the part of the soberer folk; but the emergence of Queen Victoria from her seclusion, the swelling tide of Imperialistic sentiment, together with his own good nature and public spirit, made him a popular figure years before he became King. While he was an ardent promoter of philanthropic causes and a ready and gracious speaker at dedications of public buildings and other ceremonious occasions, unhappily his mother excluded him from serious political activities; it was not till Gladstone's last Ministry (1892–1894), that Cabinet business was regularly communicated to him, and he did not have unrestricted access to foreign dispatches until Salisbury took the Premiership for the third and last time in 1895. But if he was not studious or systematically trained, he was observant; he gathered stores of information from those with whom he conversed and retained what he heard. He was widely traveled: he visited, at one time or another, the chief possessions of the British Empire, and was accustomed to spend parts of each year in Continental capitals and watering places. In his close association with foreign Sovereigns and foreign ambassadors he learned much that was officially kept from him; but he knew little and cared little for routine matters domestic or foreign.

First Measures of the New Reign and the Retirement of Salisbury. — King Edward opened Parliament in person, 14 February, 1901, and read the speech from the throne, formalities which the late Queen had for years dispensed with. The Commons voted him a Civil List of £470,000, an increase of £85,000 over that which Victoria had received; but the step was bitterly opposed by the Radicals, the Laborites and the Irish Nationalists. Another important measure, carried in this session, was a Royal Titles Bill adding to the royal style "all the British Dominions beyond the Seas."[1] Salisbury, who was in failing health, resigned, 11 July, 1902, and died 22 August of the following year. He was succeeded by his nephew, Mr. Arthur Balfour.

Chamberlain and "Tariff Reform"[2] (1903). — On 15 May, 1903, Chamberlain raised the issue of Tariff Reform in a speech at Birmingham advocating preferential tariffs and reciprocity in Colonial trade, and retaliation, where necessary, in the case of foreign countries. In this and subsequent speeches he argued that the whole fiscal situation had changed since the days of Cobden and Bright, that Great Britain's exports were decreasing and her imports increasing. He did not purpose to tax raw materials, but advocated moderate duties on corn, flour, meats, dairy produce (counterbalanced by reductions on tea, coffee, cocoa, and sugar), and foreign manufactures. In this way, he insisted, Great Britain would have a means of bargaining with the Colonies and supplying them with the products of industries which they had not yet started; of preventing other countries from dumping their products on British shores; and of increasing the revenue. Business depression, lack of employment, the deficit due to the Boer War, and the growing enthusiasm for Colonial unity all told in his favor, though his opponents argued that the country needed cheap food and that it was impossible to increase the customs revenue and keep out imports at the same time. His resignation from the Cabinet was announced, 18 September, and he was followed into retirement by various free-trade Unionists, of whom the Duke of Devonshire was the most influential. Apparently Mr. Balfour was ready to go too far for them and not far enough for Chamberlain. He was inclined to favor the principle of retaliation, without taxing food, but declared that the question of preferential tariffs could not be raised during the present Parliament.

[1] The full royal title was: "Edward VII, by the Grace of God, of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and of all the British Dominions beyond the Seas, King, Defender of the Faith, Emperor of India."

[2] This meant an alteration of the tariff in the direction of protection instead of in the direction of free trade, as is the usage in the United States.

Army Reform (1904). — The miscarriages of the South African War and the defects in military training and equipment which it manifested, forced the Government, in 1904, to undertake a comprehensive scheme of army reform. A Defense Committee was constituted, with the Prime Minister as its head, to deal with estimates and questions of larger military policy; and at the same time the Commander-in-Chief was replaced by an Army Council made up of four military [1] and three Parliamentary members, headed by the Secretary of State for War.

The Fall of the Balfour Ministry (December, 1905). — The Balfour Ministry was steadily growing weaker. While the Prime Minister persisted in treating the tariff question as irrelevant and staving it off, the Liberals were gaining new strength. Besides the tariff, which had caused a split in the Unionist ranks, there were various other difficulties confronting the Government. For one thing, the Nonconformists were opposing the Education Act of 1902 by a policy of passive resistance, withdrawing their children from the denominational schools and refusing to contribute financial support. Also, the Ministry had aroused great dissatisfaction by sanctioning ordinances, prompted by the South African mine owners, for admitting Chinese coolie labor into the Rand, a proceeding which strengthened the conviction that the Boer War had been waged in the interests of the capitalists. In view of all these and other difficulties, — for instance the fact that many had begun to tire of ten continuous years of Conservative rule, — Mr. Balfour tendered his resignation, 4 December, 1905, counting, it is said, on the hope that the Liberals would not be able to form a Cabinet and that his party would be recalled to power.

A New Liberal Régime (1906). — On 5 December, 1905, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman was summoned to form a Cabinet. The main features of the Liberal program were: the exclusion of Chinese labor from the Transvaal; the emendation of the Education Act in the interest of the Nonconformists; the reduction and national control of liquor licenses; and sweeping measures for social and industrial betterment. One of the first steps was to stop the further importation of Chinese into South Africa. Among the other important measures carried during the next two or three years were the Trades Disputes Bill, the Workmen's Compensation Bill, the Small Holdings Bill and

[1] They were: the Chief of the General Staff; the Adjutant-General; the Quartermaster-General, and the Master-General of the Ordnance. Responsible to the Army Council, but separate from it, was the Department of Inspector-General of the Forces.

the Old Age Pensions Bill already described. On the other hand, a Licensing Bill and an Education Bill — the latter twice — were defeated in the House of Lords. Thus the Liberal party with an overwhelming majority in the Lower House was able to carry only part of its program owing to the Conservative strength which invariably dominates the Peers, a situation which led Sir Henry Bannerman to declare in October, 1907, that the constitution of the Upper House would have to be altered. However, he did not live to finish the fight; owing to a breakdown in health he resigned 5 April, 1908.[1]

Mr. Lloyd George's Budget of 1909 and the War against the House of Lords. — The King summoned Mr. Asquith to assume the Premiership. In the reconstructed Cabinet, Mr. Lloyd George became Chancellor of the Exchequer, and his revolutionary Budget forced the issue. Confronted, in consequence of increased naval estimates and the expense of the new social industrial legislation, with a deficit of £16,500,000, he proceeded, in April, 1909, to frame a Budget based on principles very unpalatable to the Opposition, who insisted that a tariff was the only reasonable means of enhancing the revenue. Chief among his recommendations were: increased duties on the luxuries of the masses, notably liquor and tobacco; taxation of the excess of wealth by an increase of the income tax and the succession duties, and a higher rate for unearned incomes, from which he anticipated a revenue of over £7,000,000; heavy rates on monopolies, such as liquor licenses; and — what roused a furious outcry — on unearned increments of land, that is, the increase in site-values of unoccupied and uncultivated lots. In general, the aim of the Budget was to meet the deficit to a large degree by "shifting the burden of taxation from the producers to the possessors of wealth." The Finance Bill, based upon it, was introduced, 26 May, and was hotly attacked on the ground that it discriminated unfairly, that it struck at security of property, and that it would drive capital from the country. Still, it finally passed the Commons, 5 November, but was rejected by the Lords, on the 30th, until the judgment of the country could be obtained — a step which Mr. Asquith denounced as "a wanton breach of the settled practice of the Constitution."[2] In January, 1910, an appeal was made to the country in a general election, when the issue was fought on the Budget, the abolition of the veto power of the House of Lords, and the introduction of a scheme of Home Rule; for the Irish Nationalists had agreed to support the Government on condition that the power

[1] He died 22 April.

[2] While right of the Peers to amend money bills had been given up in 1678, they had never abandoned their right to veto, though they had long ceased to exercise it.

of the Peers be so reduced that they would be unable to defeat a new measure of Home Rule. The result of the election showed a striking falling off in the Liberal majority.[1]

The Parliament Bill of 1911. — On 10 May, three resolutions passed the House of Commons. (1) Henceforth, the Lords should have no right to veto a money bill; if, in one month, they refused their assent it should, nevertheless, go to the King for his signature, the power to determine whether any particular measure was a money bill being left to the Speaker. (2) Any measure, not a money bill, passing the Commons in three successive sessions might, in spite of the veto of the House of Lords, be submitted to the King for his approval, provided that, in each instance, it had been submitted to the Peers one month before the close of the session, and provided that two years had elapsed since its first introduction. (3) The maximum life of a Parliament should henceforth be five years instead of seven. A conference between the party leaders, which continued at intervals from 17 June until 10 November, failed to arrive "at any decision"; then, in the Lords, on the second reading of the Parliament Bill, based on the three resolutions of 21 April, the Marquis of Lansdowne moved — as an alternative to the Government scheme — a plan for reconstructing the Upper House by making it more representative, reducing the Conservative majority, and slightly curtailing its powers. As a consequence, Parliament was dissolved 28 November and a general election was held for the second time within a year, with the Lansdowne resolutions as the official program of the Unionist party. The result was a net gain of only two seats for the Liberal coalition.

On 21 February, 1911, Mr. Asquith introduced his Parliament Bill into the House of Commons, and although Lord Lansdowne introduced a new alternative scheme in the House of Lords, the Parliament Bill passed the Upper House with amendments, 20 July; but Mr. Asquith refused to accept the amendments, and announced that he had, before the election, secured the assent of the King to create a sufficient number of Peers to carry the Bill if necessary. As a result, the Bill, without amendments, passed the Lords 10 August, and received the royal assent 18 August, in spite of the "Die-Hards" or "Forwards" led by Lord Halsbury, who had pledged themselves to die in the last ditch. On 24 August the Commons voted to pay their members salaries of £400 a year.

The Accession of George V (6 May, 1910). — King Edward did not live to see the end of the struggle. He died 6 May, 1910, and his

[1] The final returns were: Liberals, 275; Labor party, 40; Nationalists, 71; Independent Nationalists, 11; Unionists, 273.

eldest surviving son was proclaimed, 9 May, as George V.[1] In the winter of 1911–1912 the new King and Queen paid a visit to India for the purpose of holding a coronation Durbar.

Labor Disturbances (1911–1912). — At home, the opening years of the reign of George V were disturbed not only by a grave constitutional crisis but by serious labor troubles. Distressingly frequent in recent times, the year 1911 proved to be an "unprecedented year of strikes," which reached the dimensions of a veritable epidemic during the weeks immediately following the coronation. The strikes in 1912 were less in number than in 1911, but, considering the number of persons involved and the loss of time and money, they were more serious than in any previous year in English history. Worst of all was the coal strike, occasioned by the demand for a minimum wage for all underground workers. On 26 February, the first miners went out in Derbyshire, and by 2 March all the mines in the country, except a few private ones, were idle. At length the Government stepped in and passed a Minimum Wage Bill, 29 March, providing for joint district boards under an independent chairman chosen either by agreement or by the Board of Trade. When Mr. Asquith, however, refused a demand that a minimum wage should be fixed in all cases at 2*s*. for boys and 5*s*. for men, a majority voted against resumption of work; but a conference of miners' delegates, 6 April, declared for resumption, since a majority of two thirds was necessary to call a strike. After the Easter holidays most of the men were back. The strike had involved 1,000,000 mine workers and 500,000 from allied industries, and, from the time when the first men went out, had lasted six weeks. This, and the failure of the London dockers and transport workers to bring about a general strike in July, struck a hard blow at syndicalism. On the whole, in spite of these labor disturbances the year was one of prosperity in trade, and higher wages and shorter hours were very general.

The Revival of Home Rule and the Ulster Opposition. — The leading features of the Liberal program were Home Rule, the disestablishment of the Welsh Church,[2] and the abolition of plural voting, or the introduction of the principle of "one man, one vote." The prospect of Home Rule aroused a determined opposition in Ulster led by Sir Edward Carson, who soon attained such an ascendancy in the Province as to gain the name of "King Carson." On 11 April,

[1] On 31 August, 1910, after a long struggle, an Accession Declaration Act was passed which shortened the form of the oath, and removed the phrases offensive to Roman Catholics.

[2] A subject which had been under discussion for some years.

1912, the Home Rule Bill was introduced into the House of Commons.[1] Although objections to the financial provisions of the Bill were pointed out and the advantage Ireland would have over Wales and Scotland, the chief criticism was directed against the injustice to Ulster, and motions were made to exclude the four northeast counties of Antrim, Armagh, Down, and Londonderry, which are prevailingly Protestant.[2] In August, it was announced that the men of Ulster would pledge themselves to a solemn covenant for united resistance to Home Rule and for refusal to accept it if it were set up. A series of great demonstrations culminated with the signing of the Covenant at Belfast, 28 September. On 12 July, 1913, there was another demonstration attended by 150,000 Ulstermen and a resolution was adopted to resist Home Rule by force of arms if necessary; the enrollment of the Ulster volunteers began, and, by December, the numbers had reached 100,000. All through July and August Sir Edward Carson went through Ulster making speeches, declaring that, in the event of the Home Rule Bill passing, Ulster would set up a provincial government and refuse to pay taxes to the Parliament at Dublin. In December the Government prohibited the importation of arms; but it was a question whether the proclamation was legal, and certainly it was not effective in preventing gun running. Mr. Winston Churchill suggested a possible scheme of devolution, but the Cabinet were under pledge to the Nationalists to carry a Home Rule Bill before considering any form of modification; the only alternatives seemed to be to take a referendum which the Unionists desired, or to run the risk of civil war if the Home Rule Bill were pressed to a final passage.

The Passage of the Home Rule Bill (1914). — On 10 February, 1914, Parliament met. Among the chief features of its program

[1] It provided for a Parliament in Ireland consisting of a Senate of 40 members and a House of Commons of 164 members. Ulster, which was to have 59 members, was to be safeguarded by the provision that the Irish Parliament could not make any law "either directly or indirectly to establish or endow any religion or prohibit the free exercise thereof, or give any preference, privilege or advantage or impose any disability or disadvantage on account of religious belief or religious or ecclesiastical status." Furthermore, the Irish Parliament could not legislate on peace or war, the navy, army, foreign relations, trade outside Ireland, coinage or legal tender. The executive was to remain vested in the Sovereign or his representative, and 42 members from Ireland were to be elected to the British House of Commons.

[2] The Province of Ulster consists of 9 counties, or 11 including Belfast and Derry City. It returns 17 Home-Rulers and 16 anti-Home-Rulers, and, if the large and wealthy city of Belfast were excluded, the Roman Catholics would be in the majority. They have a strong minority in the four Protestant counties. The problem of exclusion is complicated by the Roman Catholic minority in the four counties and the Protestants scattered through the rest of Ireland.

were: (1) a Bill for Irish Home Rule which had already passed in two successive sessions and been vetoed by the Lords; (2) a Bill for the disestablishment of the Welsh Church which had had the same history; (3) a Plural Voting Bill; and (4) reconstruction of the House of Lords. The Home Rule Bill continued as the center of interest. The Unionist Opposition, realizing that they could not defeat the measure in the House of Commons, determined to force a dissolution, to secure an appeal to the country by a referendum or to intimidate the Liberals by threats of civil war in Ulster. On 2 March appeared a Declaration signed by twenty English subjects headed by Earl Roberts, to the effect that "the claim of the Government to carry the Home Rule Bill into law without submitting it to the judgment of the nation, is contrary to the spirit of our Constutition," and that, if it was so passed, they would hold themselves "justified in taking or supporting any action that may be effective to prevent it being put into operation, and more particularly to prevent the armed forces of the Crown being used to deprive the people of Ulster of their rights as citizens of the United Kingdom." Five days later, Mr. Asquith laid a compromise scheme before Parliament, providing that, before the Bill became operative, the parliamentary electors in each of the nine counties of Ulster might decide by vote whether their county should be excluded from the arrangement for a term of six years. Mr. Bonar Law, leader of the Conservatives, said that if the Government insisted on the excluded counties coming in at the end of six years the Unionists could not accept the plan. He again urged dissolution and submission of the whole question to the electors, though he later intimated that he would agree to leave the question of the term of the exclusion to a future Parliament. Then came a crisis. On 20 March the Government issued an order that was interpreted by several of the army officers as a step toward the coercion of Ulster, and they forthwith resigned. Colonel Seely, the Secretary for War, at once assured them that they had misunderstood the order, which was purely a precautionary measure, and that the Government had no intention of using the suppression of disorder to crush political opposition to Home Rule, whereupon they withdrew their resignation. The Radical Press at once raised the cry of "army dictation." Colonel Seely, taking the blame on himself, offered his resignation; Mr. Asquith refused to accept it, but repudiated the guarantee, and the Army Council framed an order to the effect that, henceforth, no officer was to ask for or receive any assurances "as to orders which he may be required to fulfill." This led to the resignation of various officers including Sir John (now Viscount) French, the Chief of the General

Staff. Colonel Seely offered his resignation a second time, which the Prime Minister now accepted, assuming the Secretaryship for War himself. Sir Edward Grey threw out a hint that within six years some form of devolution might be devised, while John Redmond, the leader of the Irish Nationalists, who had previously insisted that there should be no "watering down" of the Home Rule Bill, declared that he was ready to exert himself to placate Ulster and to do all possible to reach an honorable settlement. On 25 May the Home Rule Bill passed the House of Commons by a majority of 77; it was signed by the King, 17 September, but, in consequence of the Great War in which Great Britain had in the meantime been plunged, it never went into operation.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

R. H. Gretton, *A Modern History of the English People, 1880–1910* (2 vols., 1913), rather journalistic and Liberal in sympathy, but clear and vivid. Slater, *The Making of Modern England*, is helpful. Among the biographies relating to this period are: H. Spender, *Herbert Henry Asquith* (1915): W. M. Short, *The Mind of Arthur James Balfour* (1918); Frank Dilnot, *Lloyd George, The Man and his Story* (1917); St. J. G. Ervine, *Sir Edward Carson and the Ulster Movement* (1915), and W. B. Wells, *The Life of John Redmond* (1919). *The International Year Book*, *The Annual Register*, *The Statesman's Year Book*, and Whitaker's *Almanack* are very useful. See also *Dictionary of National Biography*, Supplements I and II. For Ireland, see chs. LIV and LX, for foreign affairs ch. LVIII.

CHAPTER LVII

A CENTURY OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF GREATER BRITAIN

Greater Britain. — One of the most significant features of the nineteenth century has been the growth of the British Empire, which, in 1911, included an area of 13,153,712 square miles and 434,286,650 inhabitants — nearly one quarter of the land surface of the globe and slightly more than a quarter of the world's population. The Imperial dominion comprises territories in Europe, Asia, Africa, America, and Oceania, territories that may be grouped under two main heads, depending upon their form of government. 1. The Self-governing Colonies — Canada, Newfoundland, Australia, New Zealand, and the Union of South Africa — which, although nominally under Governor-Generals sent out by the King, are really governed by Ministers responsible to elected assemblies. While the Crown has the power of veto, it is ordinarily exercised only when a Dominion measure is *ultra vires*, or in conflict with some Imperial law or interest, and Dominion assemblies do, without interference, control their own military forces, impose taxes and duties, and even forbid the immigration of certain classes of British subjects.[1] 2. Crown Colonies. These may be subdivided into three classes. In the first, there is an approximation to responsible government, for they have a legislative assembly, wholly or partly elected, in addition to an executive council appointed by the Crown or the Governor of the colony. The Bahamas, Jamaica, Mauritius, and Malta fall within this group. In the next category, both the legislative and the executive councils are appointed. Ceylon and the Straits Settlements have this form of government. Finally, there are possessions, like Gibraltar and St. Helena, where both the executive and legislative powers are vested in the Governor alone. Outside the categories of Self-governing and Crown colonies are various possessions or quasi-possessions. India is a dependency under a special form of government to be described in another con-

[1] Aside from the veto, the only control exercised by the Home Government is in foreign policy and certain judicial appeals.

nection. Then there are Protectorates — for example, British East Africa, Uganda, Nigeria, and, since 1914, Egypt, which retain their native government under British supervision and control. Finally, there are spheres of influence, where other foreign countries agree not to acquire territory or ascendancy, either by annexation or treaty.

The Growth of the Empire. — With the exception of Canada and portions of India, the greater part of the present Empire was only acquired or settled during the last century. For a generation and more after the loss of the American possessions and the publication of the *Wealth of Nations*, the view persisted that the monopoly of the Colonial market and trade should be in the hands of British manufacturers and merchants, though the Colonies were favored in various ways at the expense of other countries — by differential duties and by the exclusive right of supplying the Mother Country with goods not produced by the native British. Aside from the political evil of alienating the subjects beyond the seas, this system was attended with two economic disadvantages: it fostered the growth of industries more naturally adapted to other countries, and raised the cost for the consumer. Some attacked the system; then, after its exclusiveness had been modified by Huskisson in the early twenties, and particularly after the troubles with Jamaica in the succeeding decade,[1] others came to question the worth of foreign possessions at all. Until well past the middle of the century, leading statesmen of the *laissez-faire* school were insistent on the desirability of limiting "our Colonial empire," while, on one occasion, in a burst of impatience, even Disraeli — who later did so much to popularize Imperialism — referred to the Colonies as "millstones about our necks." Meantime, however, the development of steam navigation began to alter the situation. Emigration was stimulated, and the value of the Colonies came to be realized as a refuge for redundant population, as an outlet for superfluous capital, as a source of food and raw materials, and as a market for manufactured goods. The real beginning of the movement dates from 1819, when the Government appropriated £50,000 "to send a few hundred laborers to Cape Town." About 5000 ultimately went. Many would have preferred the United States or Canada; but the Government insisted on South Africa, partly because it did not want to send its subjects to a foreign country and partly because South Africa lay on the trade route to the East and because its climate was less rigorous than the Canadian. Later, although it advanced further small sums to emigrants, the Government ceased to dictate. As a result, the majority went to North America; moreover, about the

[1] See above pp. 621, 663.

middle of the century a preference for the United States over Canada became peculiarly marked, owing to the desire of the Irish, driven from home by the potato famine and the events which followed, to settle outside the British dominions. In the meanwhile, Edward Gibbon Wakefield (1796–1862) who had sought a new home in the far-off Pacific where he might live down a reprehensible early career, had "helped to create a new enthusiasm for Empire" among the thinkers and statesmen of his native England. His views were briefly stated in his *Letter from Sydney* (1829), and afterwards elaborated in his *Art of Colonization* (1847). Largely through his efforts, and the men he influenced, a society was formed in 1830 for systematic colonization. Furthermore, a Canadian crisis led to a famous *Report* by Lord Durham, containing an eloquent plea for the development of Colonial possessions, so far as possible on a self-governing basis, which greatly furthered the new movement. As a result of all these factors there began to develop, shortly after the middle of the century, an enthusiasm for Imperialism which was first strikingly manifested at Victoria's Jubilee in 1887. Before proceeding to describe it more in detail, it might be well to consider briefly the course of events in the separate colonies during the century.

The Canadian Problem (1791–1837). — While the Mother Country succeeded in retaining her hold in Canada when the thirteen Colonies broke away, grave difficulties developed which came to a head in the beginning of Victoria's reign. The population there consisted of two sharply distinct elements. One was the original French stock — Roman Catholic in faith and bound by ancient racial traditions — which, under the Quebec Act of 1774, enjoyed freedom of worship and the privilege of trial by French law in civil cases. The other element was made up of British emigrants, pushing, progressive, and chiefly Protestants. In 1791, Pitt carried the Quebec Government Bill which divided the country into two provinces of Upper and Lower Canada with the object of separating the British in the west from the French in the older eastern part — a measure that was opposed unsuccessfully by Fox, who was in favor of uniting rather than dividing the races. For each province the same form of government, on the English model, was set up — a governor, an executive and legislative council of life members, all appointed by the Crown, together with a representative assembly whose members were elected every four years. Since the inert French occupied much of the more desirable situation on the lower St. Lawrence and lay as a barrier between the newer settlements and the sea,[1] the British pressed in and succeeded in forcing into the

[1] Aside from certain areas settled by Imperial Loyalists.

legislative council a number of their candidates, many of whom were professional politicians and agitators who fomented discontent. The French resented this intrusion; moreover, they regarded as a particular grievance the fact that one seventh of all Canadian lands was set apart for the maintenance of the Anglican clergy.[1] The crisis began to develop, when, in 1832, the legislative assembly of Lower Canada refused to grant money for the payment of the councilors, whom they regarded as British agents.

The Canadian Revolt (1837). — For five years they continued to hold up supplies, while the executive authorities seized, for their salaries and other expenses, such moneys as they could get their hands on. The Assembly insisted on their rights to control the revenue and the public lands as well, and demanded further that the legislative council should be made elective. Finally, under the lead of Louis Joseph Papineau, they refused to carry on public business, and were declared dissolved. Stormy meetings of protest followed, and an attempt to arrest the chief malcontents resulted in armed outbreak, in 1837, which was not put down without bloodshed.[2]

Lord Durham's Mission (1838). — The Home Secretary carried a bill, in 1838, to suspend the constitution of Lower Canada and to send out a Lord High Commissioner "with full powers to deal with the rebellion, and to remodel the constitution of both provinces." Lord Durham, chosen for the post, was an advanced reformer, and a man of abilities and energy, but of a fiery and masterful temper, and wholly devoid of tact. His mission saved Canada, but at the cost of his own career. On his arrival, in May, 1838, he at once assumed the position of a dictator; he issued a proclamation in which, while he threatened extreme punishment for the rebellious, he invited the Colonists to coöperate with him in devising a system of government suited to their needs. In spite of the fact that his original powers had been greatly reduced since his appointment, he next proceeded to launch a series of ordinances, proclaiming "a very liberal amnesty," with striking exceptions. He forbade certain leaders who had escaped, Papineau among the number, to return under pain of death; furthermore, he exiled to Bermuda others who were in custody. While his method was high-handed, his aim was just and merciful; for he wanted

[1] These were the so-called "clergy reserves." In addition the Crown reserved another seventh, and much more was appropriated by influential jobbers.

[2] Although the disaffection spread to Upper Canada, where discontent — due to the facts that the council was not responsible to the legislature and that the government was in the hands of a few wealthy families — was fostered by republican sympathizers from across the border, the trouble did not attain serious dimensions.

to carry on his work of reorganization free from hostile interference. Moreover, trusting in the righteousness of his intentions, he set aside the Council, and selected advisers chiefly from his own secretaries and other officials. The event showed that he aimed to use his powers for the establishment of a liberal constitutional government; but his dictatorial methods aroused a fury of opposition in Canada and in England, with the result that he was recalled and his Quebec ordinances were disallowed.

Durham's Report and its Consequences. — Although his mission seemed a failure, it bore enduring fruit in his famous *Report*, printed in February, 1839, which "laid the foundations of the political success and social prosperity not only of Canada but of all other important colonies." Durham advised that, except in the matters affecting the relations between the Colonies and the Mother Country — such as foreign affairs, defense and the regulation of trade — the making and execution of the laws should be in the hands of the Colonists themselves. All officials, except the Governor and his secretary, were to be responsible to the elected legislature. The "clergy reserves" were to be abolished.[1] Upper and Lower Canada were to be again united with an assembly representing both provinces. Furthermore, the other British North American Colonies might, with the consent of the Canadian Government, be admitted to the union. In short, the Durham Report recommended not only representative but responsible government in internal affairs, reunion, and possible federation. In July, 1840, the Canada Government Bill, reuniting the two provinces, with a single legislature, passed through the British Parliament and was carried into effect the following year. Although his recommendation for a responsible Ministry was not incorporated into the law, it was adopted as a matter of practice in 1847. Constitutions on the Durham model were granted during the next few years to such British possessions as were capable of exercising the privilege in every quarter of the globe. In Canada, however, the united legislature, with French and British elements working at cross purposes, presented difficulties, with the consequence that a solution of the problem was sought in Durham's suggestion of a federation, an arrangement which would have the further advantage of strengthening the country against annexationist designs on the part of the United States, of which there had been a growing, though probably groundless fear. In 1867, by the British North America Act, the four provinces of Quebec (Lower Canada), Ontario (Upper Canada), New Brunswick, and Nova Scotia were

[1] In 1854, with reservation for vested rights, they were turned over for educational purposes.

combined into a federal union under the name of the Dominion of Canada. The formal executive was vested in the Governor-General appointed by the Crown, who was in turn to choose Lieutenant-Governors for the federated provinces. The real working executive, however, was vested in a Prime Minister, responsible to a federal Parliament consisting of a senate, composed of members appointed for life by the Governor-General, and a representative legislature. Each province was to have also a ministry and a legislature for local concerns.[1]

Relations with Great Britain. — In 1846, Great Britain adopted Free Trade, and three years later repealed the Navigation Laws which forbade foreign ships from trading to Colonial ports and also prohibited direct colonial trade with foreign countries. Henceforth, Canada, — and the other Self-governing Colonies as well, — was absolutely free in respect to its foreign trade policy, free to establish tariffs even against Great Britain, and, as a matter of fact, she finally adopted a protective tariff on manufactures including those of the Mother Country.[2] Except that she is formally under a Governor-General appointed by the Crown and cannot pursue an independent foreign policy, Canada is practically an independent State. With a population about one fourth French, problems of religion and language have caused inevitable friction, but her loyalty was strikingly manifested by the prompt and willing contingents which she sent to aid the British during the Boer War, and the recent great European War.

Relations with the United States. — By the Rush-Bagot Convention of 1818 it was agreed that there should be no armed ships on the Great Lakes and no fortresses on the land frontier between the United States and Canada. The boundary line separating the two countries now extends from the Atlantic to the Pacific, a distance of over three thousand miles. This long undefended frontier, the longest in the world's history, is at once an indication and a further cause of the fundamentally peaceful attitude of the two neighbors toward one another. Yet more than one point of difference has arisen requiring patient adjustment. The Maine and Oregon boundary disputes were settled by the United States and Great Britain in 1842 and 1846 respectively. By an award of 20 October, 1903, a long-standing controversy regarding the Alaska boundary was at length decided. While the extreme

[1] British Columbia, including Vancouver Island, and Prince Edward Island joined the Dominion in 1871 and 1873 respectively. In 1870 the Dominion Government purchased the vast possessions of the Hudson Bay Company, out of which the new province of Manitoba and the Northwest Territories were created in the same year. Part of the latter was carved into the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan in 1905. Newfoundland alone still remains outside the Dominion of Canada.

[2] Great Britain, however, has for some years been favored by preferential duties.

claims of the United States were not recognized, the Canadians were disappointed of their hope of access to the sea in that region and their two delegates refused to sign. Although the British representative, Lord Alverstone, affixed his signature, the general feeling in England was that the United States had got the better of the bargain. On the other hand, an award at the Hague, September, 1910, adjusting the Atlantic fisheries dispute, was mainly in favor of Great Britain, though there were reservations in support of American interests. Furthermore, the matter of trade relations has been a fruitful source of discord. In 1854 Canada entered into a treaty with the United States providing for reciprocal free trade in natural products, an arrangement which was terminated by the United States in 1865, owing largely to resentment against the unsympathetic attitude adopted by the British Government during the Civil War. Canadian efforts to restore the old arrangements proved unavailing. The protected interests which grew up owing to the policy subsequently adopted, were greatly alarmed when a Liberal Administration under Sir Wilfrid Laurier negotiated an agreement with the United States, published 26 January, 1911, providing for a substantially free exchange of natural, especially food products and for a mutual reduction of duties on manufactured goods. The arrangement was ratified by the United States Senate, 22 July; but, in a parliamentary election in September, the Laurier party was defeated and its reciprocity treaty rejected. The entrance, since then, of the two neighboring countries into the Great War for the preservation of the democratic ideals which are their common heritage, furnishes a unique opportunity for a closer bond of fellowship in the future.

Great Britain and the United States. — During the century of peace following the War of 1812 inevitable differences, besides those in which Canada was involved, have arisen between Great Britain and the United States. Among the outstanding ones, the questions arising out of the Civil War and the Venezuela case have already been touched upon. Not only were these adjusted amicably, but, during the last half century, particularly since the impulse to democracy given by the Reform Bill of 1867, Anglo-American relations have grown increasingly satisfactory; indeed, at the time of the Spanish-American War, Great Britain was our chief, almost our only European friend. Ten years later, following as far as possible the recommendations of the Second Hague Conference of 1907, the two countries concluded an arbitration treaty, excluding, however, from compulsory arbitration subjects affecting the "independence" or "honor" or "vital interests" of the two countries or "the interests of third parties." The Treaty, which was for five years, was renewed in the spring of 1914,

though there was a groundless fear on the part of certain United States senators that it might be invoked to force an arbitration of the vexed question of the Panama tolls. The Clayton-Bulwer Treaty of 19 April, 1850, had provided for the common use and neutral control of any canal constructed by the Nicaragua or Panama routes, and the British agreed not to make any settlements in Central America. This was superseded by the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty, 18 November, 1901, by which Great Britain gave up all claims to any share in the construction or control of a canal from the Atlantic to the Pacific, but on condition that the navigation be free to ships of all nations on equal terms. On 24 August, 1912, a bill signed by President Taft for the regulation of the Panama Canal, then nearing completion, exempted from tolls American shipping engaged in coastwise trade. Regarding this as a violation of the spirit of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty, the British Government framed a protest which was presented at Washington, 9 December, Sir Edward Grey suggesting that if the United States could not accept the British interpretation they should refer the matter to arbitration. The arbitration stage, however, was never reached; for, acting on a recommendation of President Wilson in a message to Congress, 5 March, 1914, it was voted, 12 June, to repeal the exemption clause, though with the proviso that the United States did not thereby relinquish any of its rights.

The upheaval in Mexico following the overthrow of President Diaz, and the policy of "watchful waiting" adopted by President Wilson resulted, for a time, in a far greater strain on Anglo-American friendship. In January, 1914, the *Spectator* voiced the sentiment of many Englishmen when it declared that "if external force is used to restore order it must be by the United States alone," and complained that the President "deprecates anarchy and bloodshed, but neither stops them himself nor allows anybody else to stop them." As time went on, German intrigue contributed not a little to embitter the situation; but wise moderation averted a possible rupture, and the Mexican imbroglio was dwarfed by vaster issues. It is to be hoped that it may straighten itself out, and that any surviving difficulties may be adjusted in the sage spirit of good will characteristic of recent Anglo-American relations.

The Beginnings of Australia. — In a little more than a century there has grown up, in the southern hemisphere, a new Britain with an area equal to the United States, but with a population as yet no greater than that of the city of New York. The Venetian traveler Marco Polo (1254–1324) refers to a land now generally believed to be Australia, though the name originated with the Spanish explorer, De Quiros, about

1605. The Dutchman, Abel Tasman, discovered New Zealand about 1642 and visited the island south of Australia which now bears his name, though he called it Van Diemen's Land, after the Governor of Java. More than a hundred years later, Captain Cook, with the members of an astronomical expedition, landed at Poverty Bay, New Zealand, in 1769. After sailing around the islands, he proceeded to Australia, explored the southeastern coast, and named it New South Wales. The Spanish and the Dutch, who had been first on the ground, made no effort to found settlements, and the vast territories fell to the latest comers, the British. In 1787–1788, Captain Phillip was sent out with a shipload of convicts and founded a city at Port Jackson which he named Sydney. But conditions were hard, the convicts ignorant and intractable, and the real need was for men of agricultural experience and capital. Tempted " with the promise of land, implements, and food," a few families began to come out, grants were also made to convicts whose terms had expired, as well as to some of the guards, and the free population increased slowly until New South Wales, as the new State was called, numbered, in 1821, nearly 40,000 inhabitants. Unfortunately, however, there was a great disproportion of men, and drunkenness was a fruitful cause of disorder. Meantime, the sheep-raising industry, which was to prove the main source of Australian prosperity, had been introduced, in 1791, by John MacArthur, who soon had a flock of 1000. The numbers multiplied steadily until, in 1909, there were 46,187,678.

During a drought, in 1812–1813, some of the colonists crossed the Blue Mountains, where they found a rich fertile soil. Danger of French rivalry and increase of immigration contributed further to extend the area of settlement. In 1826, the Governor of New South Wales received instructions to assert the British claim to the whole of Australia and to occupy the stations on the western shore. Thus began, in 1829, the settlement of West Australia. An attempt to develop the Colony was made by private individuals; but the experiment proved a failure. In 1838 there were only 2000 inhabitants, and, in 1849, not more than 5000. Meantime, Wakefield published his *Letter from Sydney*, already referred to, which marks an epoch in Australian colonization. He insisted that lands should be sold to settlers in small lots and at reasonably high prices, and that the proceeds should be used to pay the passage of emigrant laborers and for general government expenses. A company on his plan was formed to colonize South Australia. Unwisely ignoring Wakefield's qualification that natural pasture should be leased on moderate terms, the Colonial Office — hitherto very lavish in grants to the favored — fixed a price per acre too high for the sheep-

raisers to pay. So they moved inland and occupied fresh lands for which they paid nothing at all — hence they were known as "squatters." [1] Eventually a compromise was arranged by which they were given temporary rights of occupancy at a low rent. In 1825 Van Diemen's Land, or Tasmania — as it came to be called — which had been settled as a subordinate penal settlement in 1803, was made a separate colony. In 1851 Victoria was made independent of New South Wales; then Queensland, the last of the six Australian colonies, was carved out of New South Wales in 1859.

The Commonwealth of Australia. — Australia's three great problems have been: the transportation evil; the subjugation of the natives; and the establishment of free institutions, self-government and federation. After a long hard struggle transportation was abolished about 1857, though some convicts were supplied to West Australia till 1867. The Australian natives were of a very inferior type: numbers were shot for cattle stealing, more succumbed to drink and other evil habits. While a few survive in remote parts of Australia, they are now quite extinct in Tasmania. In 1842 a legislative council was established in New South Wales, but, owing to the steady growth in numbers,[2] wealth and intelligence, there was an increasing demand for more complete form of self-government. After the example had been set in Canada, New South Wales, Victoria, Tasmania, and South Australia (under a permissive Imperial Act of 1850) drew up constitutions with popularly elected legislatures, which received the sanction of the British Government in 1855. Queensland received a similar privilege in 1859 and West Australia in 1890.[3] By various extensions of the franchise, every adult man and woman has received the right to vote in every one of the six States. Besides being a pioneer in women's suffrage, Australia has taken over the Government ownership of railroads and has made a remarkable contribution in the so-called "Torrens System" of conveyancing.[4] After nearly twenty years of agitation the various states were federated into the Commonwealth of Aus-

[1] The term in this sense was of American origin. Now, in Australia it is applied to any person who owns or leases large areas for sheep or cattle raising.

[2] The discovery of copper in 1848, and more especially of gold in 1851, led to a considerable influx of settlers.

[3] Gold was discovered in West Australia in 1872 and in greater quantities in 1882 and subsequent years, with the result that the population increased to 50,000 in 1891, and to 281,000 in 1910.

[4] By an Act passed first in South Australia at the instance of Sir Richard Torrens in 1858, all estates were required to be registered, and the registered owner was considered the real owner in all future transactions. Thus, much confusion formerly arising from disputed titles has been saved.

tralia by a measure sanctioned by the Imperial Parliament in 1900. The formal executive is vested in the Sovereign, acting through the Governor-General, the actual executive in a responsible Ministry headed by a Prime Minister. There is a federal Parliament, consisting of a senate of thirty-six — six elected from each State — and a house of representatives elected on a basis of population. Such powers as are not specially vested in the federal legislature remain in the legislatures of the several States, an arrangement which differs from that in Canada where such powers as are not specially delegated to the provincial legislatures are reserved to the Dominion Parliament.

New Zealand. — In the thirties, an association, started by Wakefield, was formed for the colonization of New Zealand, a group of two large — the North and South — and some smaller islands lying about twelve hundred miles east of Australia. The British Government and the missionaries at first opposed the project, fearing that it would cause trouble with the Maoris,[1] a native race of Malay stock, highly intelligent and very warlike. Nevertheless, settlement proceeded apace; in 1839, New Zealand was declared subject to the Crown under the Governor of New South Wales, and the following year a separate colony was constituted by a charter. In 1852 a self-governing constitution was granted. New Zealand is perhaps the most progressive State in the world. Women were given the vote in 1893; like Australia it has a State-owned railway system, and in many other respects has led in State socialism, such as Government ownership of telegraphs and telephones. Moreover, it conducts most of the life, fire, and accident insurance business, and even operates some State coal mines. Under the Labor Ministry, large estates have been broken up — partly by heavy taxation, partly by compulsory sale; a State bank has been founded to lend money to small farmers for the purpose of improving their lands; and very progressive laws have been enacted for regulating factories and conditions of labor. In 1895 a carefully worked out scheme was launched for settling trade disputes and preventing strikes. In the event of a failure to agree between employers and workmen's unions, provision was made for application to a Board of Conciliation, and, in the last instance, to an Arbitration Court under a judge whose decision shall be final, and may be enforced by fine and imprisonment. As a matter of fact, laborers have proved more refractory than employers, and of late the attempt to avert strikes has been unsuccessful. In 1898, ten years before the Mother Country, a system of old age

[1] The Maoris long proved a serious problem, though, it must be admitted, they had much right on their side. Now, however, they are dying out, and in 1908 formed only 47,000 out of a population of 1,008,000.

pensions was adopted, with a weekly allowance of 10*s.* for all persons over sixty-five. In 1907 New Zealand was proclaimed a Dominion, to which various small islands in the Pacific were annexed.

The British in South Africa. — The British secured their first firm foothold in South Africa by conquering Cape Colony from the Dutch [1] during the Napoleonic Wars. The country was made self-governing in 1872. Meantime, in the early thirties, many of the Boers, or descendants of the original Dutch immigrants, had sold their farms, embarked their families and household goods in great springless carts, and, driving their stock before them, departed north and northeast to seek new homes in the haunts of savages and wild beasts. The Great Trek, or emigration, occurred in 1836, though the exodus began before and continued after that date. Much has been made of the emancipation of their slaves, for which they received, in compensation, less than half their value. As a matter of fact, only a small number of the original trekkers were slave-owners to any considerable extent, and apparently the more impelling causes which drove them forth were their restiveness under British rule and the fact that the British neither protected them against the natives nor trusted them to protect themselves. Some went to Natal; but this was taken over as a British possession and annexed to the Cape Colony in 1843, being made a separate Crown Colony in 1856. The extension of the British rule over Natal drove many of the Boers westward into the Orange River country, whither some of the first emigrants from Cape Colony had originally settled. But the British still extended their sway, and, in 1848, annexed the Orange River Colony, which led the irreconcilables to a final refuge among another group of Boers who, after the Great Trek of 1836, had made new homes for themselves in the district known as the Transvaal. By the Sand River Convention, of 1852, the independence of the Transvaal, or South African Republic, was recognized by the British Government. Two years later, the Orange River Free State was accorded the same recognition, and retained its independence until 1899.

The Zulu War (1879). — The Transvaal, however, was re-annexed by Great Britain, in 1877, on the ground that the Transvaal policy toward the natives provoked troubles and risings which menaced the peace of the other South African provinces.[2] Discontent and disorder

[1] The Dutch had founded the Colony, in 1652, as a port of call between Holland and their possessions in the East.

[2] Also the residents of the villages, largely English and Germans, in contrast to the farmers, who were Boers, petitioned for annexation to protect them against the Zulus.

were rife enough in South Africa. There were risings of the Kaffirs and other natives, and, worst of all, a formidable war with the warlike and powerful tribe of the Zulus broke out in 1879. Although there were many points of friction, the real cause of the latter was resentment of the Zulu chieftain against the British for taking the Boers, his enemies, under their protection. Feeling the need of prompt action, the Governor sent an invading force into Zululand before the Home authorities, occupied with a war in Afghanistan, had decided to send reënforcements. This, together with the fact that the commanders on the spot undervalued the fighting qualities of the natives, led to a series of British reverses before the Zulus were finally overcome. Zululand was divided among a number of chieftains and later reunited; but, owing to constant confusion and strife, part of the country was later taken over by the Transvaal and the remainder came under British protection in 1897.

The Revolt in the Transvaal (1880–1881). — Meantime, events had developed in the Transvaal leading to a great British humiliation. Gladstone, who became Premier for the second time in 1880, had encouraged the Boers, by his language during the preëlection campaign, to hope that he would reverse the action of 1877; hence, when they found that there was no hope that independence would again be granted them, they prepared for rebellion. By the end of December, 1880, British detachments had been forced to surrender, and a troop of Boers had invaded Natal. Sir George Colley, the British commander, was hampered by the desire of the Home Office to continue negotiations, by the inadequacy of his forces, and by the old British delusion that farmers would not fight. As a result, in an attempt to seize Majuba Hill, 27 February, 1881, he was attacked by the Boers, he lost his life and his little army was cut to pieces. In the teeth of this disaster, Gladstone insisted on resuming the negotiations as if nothing had happened, and self-government was restored in the Transvaal.[1] Although the arrangement continued for nearly a score of years, it satisfied almost no one. The opponents of the Ministry declared that the British had humiliated themselves by making terms with the victorious insurgents, the British supporters in South Africa complained that they had been deserted, while the Dutch, still resentful at the

[1] By the terms of the Pretoria Convention of 1881 an indefinable "suzerainty" had been reserved to the British Crown. This was superseded by the London Convention of 1884, in which this meaningless term was omitted, but in which a new provision was introduced, that "white men were to have full liberty to reside in any part of the Republic (the name South African Republic was first restored at this time), to trade in it, and to be liable to the same taxes only as those exacted from citizens of the Republic."

attempt which had been made to subjugate them, nourished the further grievance that any restrictions — notably on freedom to make foreign treaties — remained to limit their complete independence.

The Designs of Cecil Rhodes and the Discovery of Gold in the Transvaal. — Two factors ultimately combined to precipitate a crisis in South Africa. One was the ambition of a very remarkable man to make Great Britain predominant in Africa; the other was the discovery of gold in the Transvaal. Cecil Rhodes (1853–1902) was an Englishman who, as a young man, went to South Africa for his health, where he made a huge fortune, mainly out of the Kimberley diamond mines and the Transvaal gold fields, and rose to be Prime Minister of Cape Colony in 1890. While Rhodes lacked scruple in the pursuit of his aims, he was not a mere money-maker. His dream was to make his country supreme in Africa, north and south, and to unite the two by a railroad from Cairo to the Cape. Salisbury, the British Premier, enthusiastically supported a strong policy in Africa. He refused to recognize the Portuguese claim to Matabeleland and Mashonaland, which lie to the west of Portuguese East Africa,[1] and, in 1890, in return for the cession of Heligoland in the North Sea, he induced the Germans to abandon their claims to Uganda and the Upper Nile, and then recognize the British protectorate over Zanzibar. France also agreed to this, in return for the British recognition of the French protectorate over Madagascar. Steadily the British power advanced through vast stretches of the Continent. In June, 1894, because of the financial straits of the British East Africa Company, founded in 1888, the Government proclaimed a protectorate over Uganda, which not only commanded the Nile basin but might be regarded as the " key " of Central Africa. In 1899 the Niger Company was bought out for £865,000, thus adding to the Empire, Nigeria, a territory one third the size of India. Many years before, in 1882, the British occupation of Egypt had begun, while, early in 1899, British sway was extended over the Egyptian Sudan. Thus there was substantial ground for Rhodes' Cape to Cairo railway project. Furthermore, the discovery of gold in the Transvaal (1884) brought in a flood of foreigners or " Uitlanders," who were bent on developing the country, and on securing a voice in its affairs proportional to their wealth and influence. The Boers, who were mainly an agricultural people, wanted to keep the country to

[1] In October, 1888, Rhodes obtained the mining rights in Matabeleland for the British South Africa Company, which received its charter 29 October, 1889; under the chairmanship of Rhodes it extended its exploitations into Mashonaland, and the two territories, brought together under the control of the Company, came to be known as Rhodesia.

themselves,[1] they had little desire to develop it, and were determined to exclude the Uitlanders from the franchise and from all share in the government.

The Jameson Raid (1895). — In the midst of the struggle the world was startled to learn that, 29 December, 1895, Dr. Leander Jameson, the administrator of Rhodesia, had ridden into the Transvaal with a body of the Chartered Company's troops. It developed from a subsequent parliamentary inquiry that Rhodes had, as early as June, formed an agreement with the foreigners interested in the South Africa gold fields to promote a revolution in the city of Johannesburg. Telling his story quite frankly before the committee, he pointed out that the position of the Uitlanders, who owned more than half the land, nine tenths of the wealth and paid nineteen twentieths of the taxes, was intolerable; that the attitude of the South African Republic was notoriously unfriendly to Cape Colony; and stated that his aim was to secure control of the Transvaal in order to incorporate it in a projected South African federation under Great Britain. His design was to assist the insurgents, or "reformers," with the Company's forces, whereupon the British Government was to intervene and annex the country. The rising came to nothing, owing to dissension among the "reformers," for one faction was opposed to Rhodes's plan of British rule and favored an independent republic. It was after the failure of this projected rising that Jameson undertook his raid, in spite of the efforts of Rhodes and the "reformers." He was met by a force of the Boers and, after a slight engagement, was overcome and surrendered. Together with the other leading raiders, he was handed over to the British authorities, who sent them to England for trial. Jameson was sentenced to fifteen months imprisonment and some of the others to shorter terms.[2]

Drifting into War (1896–1899). — In January, 1896, Rhodes resigned as Premier of Cape Colony, and, in June, as managing director of the Chartered Company. He was never tried for his share in the conspiracy and raid, though he returned to England, in 1897, to give his testimony before the parliamentary committee. While the committee reported that "whatever the justification may have been for action on the part of the people of Johannesburg, there was none for a person in Mr. Rhodes's position," he was warmly defended in debate

[1] Though it is asserted that President Kruger invited English capital to the country through the English press in 1884.

[2] Four of the reform leaders at Johannesburg were sentenced to death; but the sentence was commuted to a fine of £25,000 each. Forty-two other members of the reform committee had to pay £2,000 each.

by the Colonial Secretary, Joseph Chamberlain, and other men of influence.[1] After the attempt to force their hand had proved futile, the Boers were more disinclined than ever to grant to the Uitlanders the concessions which they demanded and deserved.[2] Their cause was warmly espoused by the new High Commissioner, Sir Alfred Milner, who sent a strong representation to Chamberlain urging that the Government must, for its own credit, assert itself in behalf of " thousands of British subjects kept permanently in the position of helots." As a result, a series of conferences was arranged with Kruger in the early summer of 1899. They came to nothing because the British insisted on a franchise based upon five years' residence, while Kruger would concede nothing less than seven years, and hedged in with various restrictions at that. While the Unionist Government was hot for war, the Liberals opposed what they regarded as an unjust and unnecessary aggression in behalf of Rhodes and the financial interests. At length, 18 August, the Boers went so far as to offer a five years' franchise, but on conditions that the British Government would not accept, namely, that they would agree never again to interfere in the affairs of the Republic and to drop all claims to suzerainty.[3] After further vain negotiations both sides determined upon war. The Boers were far better equipped than the British imagined; for, ever since the raid, they had been quietly buying from Europe arms and ammunition of the most improved type. On 9 October they sent an ultimatum demanding the withdrawal of troops, which the British refused to consider, and, two days later, they invaded Natal. In the war which followed it required three years and cost Great Britain £250,000,000 to subdue a force of not over 60,000 fighting men.

Opening of the Boer War (October, 1899).—Neither party expected a long conflict. The Boers recalled their easy victory in 1881; they

[1] The Boers, especially President Kruger of the South African Republic, always suspected that the British Government was privy to Rhodes's schemes. These suspicions were no doubt unfounded, though it is most likely that both he and Jameson fancied that the authorities were not ignorant of their designs and would approve of them in case they succeeded.

[2] The Uitlanders stated their case in a petition, March, 1899, in which they complained that they were heavily taxed without any vote, that they were discriminated against in the matter of education, and that the municipal government, the mines and the railways were corruptly and incompetently administered. Of course the Boers regarded them as interlopers, but, if we admit their contention that they had a right to enter and develop the country, still more if they were originally invited, we must agree, after due allowance for their one-sided point of view, that their grievances were many and substantial.

[3] The British insisted that this term had been omitted accidentally from the London Convention of 1884.

counted on their admirable preparation, on the divided state of British public opinion, and the fact that their opponents had so few troops in South Africa. The British proved incapable of profiting by past experiences; they did not dream that a scanty population of farmers would be capable of effective resistance;[1] they did not realize the extent of their equipment or how peculiarly adapted they were to the kind of fighting which the nature of the country required. Moreover, British generals, trained in peace or in warfare with savages, proved at first no match for the very competent Boer commanders — De Wet, Cronje, and Botha. For the sake of political effect it was regarded as necessary to defend northern Natal; but strategically it was unwise, since the territory in question, penetrating like a wedge between the Transvaal and the Orange Free State, was exposed to attack on both sides. As a result, the British met with several reverses, and Sir George White was shut up in Ladysmith, where he had to withstand a long siege. The arrival of General Buller, as Commander-in-Chief, with reënforcements, brought no immediate relief; indeed, three defeats followed within a week. All this, however, had the effect of consolidating British public opinion in favor of the war, and of calling forth the best efforts not only of the United Kingdom but of the whole Empire; calls for volunteers met with a ready response, and the Colonies, who had already sent contingents, loyally answered the request for more. While Buller was left to operate in Natal, General Roberts[2] was put in supreme command, with General Kitchener as his chief of staff, and ordered to advance into the Transvaal through the Orange River Free State.

The End of the First Phase of the War (September, 1900). — On 15 February, 1900, Roberts succeeded in relieving Kimberley, which had been besieged for four months. Cronje, retreating toward Bloemfontein, was compelled to surrender, 27 February, and, 15 March, Roberts occupied the capital of the Orange Free State. Meantime, Buller, though he was defeated again and again, kept doggedly at his work of trying to break through the Boer lines. However, the operations of Roberts drew a portion of the enemy's forces from Natal, and 28 February, after two weeks of hard fighting, Buller succeeded in a fourth and final attempt to relieve Ladysmith, where General White had conducted an heroic defense for one hundred and eighteen days. Buller proceeded to fight his way north, and, 12 June, brought his army into the Transvaal. While Lord Roberts' overspent troops had been

[1] The veteran Commander-in-Chief Wolseley was an exception.

[2] By the end of 1900 he had an army of 250,000, a greater force, it is said, than had ever been intrusted to any single British general.

taking a six weeks' rest, General De Wet was conducting an active guerilla warfare in the south and east of the Orange Free State and creating havoc with small British detachments. Disregarding this diversion, Roberts, when he was ready, started, 1 May, for Pretoria. Johannesburg was occupied 31 May, and Pretoria was reached and taken, after slight resistance, 5 June. During the advance, Roberts' army relieved Mafeking on the Transvaal border, where Colonel Baden-Powell [1] had been gallantly holding out for some time. The backbone of the war was now broken; but De Wet was still unbeaten, and other detachments coöperating with him conducted a harrowing partisan warfare, constantly threatened Roberts' communications, and at one time, cut him off wholly from the south. Finally, General Ian Hamilton was able to effect a junction with Buller's army from Natal and to separate the Boer forces in the Transvaal from those in the Free State. The plan was to crush them in detail. While those in the hill country of the State were gradually overcome, De Wet managed to escape north. Although smaller forces continued to give trouble elsewhere, the conflict was, from the summer of 1900, concentrated mainly in the Transvaal. By September, Roberts regarded the war as practically ended, and Kruger had reached such a pitch of despair that he started for Europe. Yet, although the British Commander issued a proclamation declaring that he would treat those who still held out as rebels, it was still more than a year and a half before the supremacy of the conquerors was finally recognized.

The Concluding Stage of the War (September, 1900, to June, 1902). — The second phase of the war, which consisted in the "gradual acquisition and occupation of the country," was left to General Kitchener, who secured his conquests by blockhouses connected "by thousands of miles of barbed wire entanglement." Peace was finally concluded, 1 June, 1902, by which the Transvaal and the Orange River Free State were formally annexed. In spite of the British victory, there was so much discontent with the existing military organization, with the lack of preparation at the opening of the war, and at the disasters which marked its early stages, that it was found advisable, directly the war was over, to overhaul and reform the whole army organization in the light of the recent hard experience.

The South African Union (1909). — The enclosure and systematic devastation of certain districts necessitated the removal of Boer women and children to concentration camps where there was much inevitable suffering and death. Though this ruthless military policy was due to widespread and dogged resistance and though the sickness and death

[1] Later notable as the founder of the Boy Scouts.

AFRICA IN 1910
ENGLISH MILES
200 0 200 400 600 800 1000
REFERENCE
British
German
Portuguese
Ottoman
French
Spanish
Italian
Belgian
NOTE: The Coloring shows the possessions of the different European Powers at the present day. The independent African States are uncolored.
Williams Engraving Co.
IRELAND
ENGLAND
GERMAN EMPIRE
FRANCE
AUSTRIA-HUNGARY
RUSSIA
BLACK SEA
SPAIN
PORTUGAL
GREECE
TURKEY
PERSIA
MADEIRA IS.
AZORES IS.
CANARY IS.
MOROCCO
ALGERIA
TUNIS
TRIPOLI
Tripoli
Alexandria
Port Said
Suez
Cairo
Libyan Desert
Nubian Desert
Arabian Desert
Red Sea
Persian Gulf
Gulf of Oman
Bagdad
Kowelt
Jeddah
Mecca
Aden
Gulf of Aden
SOCOTRA
Jibuti
Berbera
SOMALILAND
ABYSSINIA
Harrar
ITALIAN SOMALILAND
PROTECT.
FRENCH WEST AFRICA
SENEGAL
GAMBIA
PORT. GUINEA
FRENCH GUINEA
SIERRA LEONE
LIBERIA
Freetown
Monrovia
IVORY COAST
GOLD COAST
DAHOMEY
NIGERIA
Timbuctu
Agades
Agadem
Say
Sokoto
Katsena
Kano
Bussa
Lagos
Kobe
El Obeid
Khartum
Omdurman
Dongola
Debbeh
Berber
Suakim
Asmara
Massowah
Gondar
Obok
Harar
Berbera
Jibuti
ANGLO-EGYPTIAN SUDAN
DAR FUR
BAHR-EL-GHAZAL
Lado
Gondokoro
UGANDA
PROTECTORATE
EAST AFRICA PROTECTORATE
BELGIAN CONGO
FRENCH CONGO
CAMEROONS
GABOON
FERNANDO PO
DO. PRINCIPE
EQUATOR
Gulf of Guinea
Leopoldville
Cabinda
Boma
Ambrix
Loanda
CONGO
KASSANGE
Kalemba
Musta Yamo
Kazembe
L. Bangweolo
L. Nyassa
L. Tanganyika
L. German
KILIMANJARO
Witu
Malindi
Mombasa
ZANZIBAR I.
Dar-es-Salaam
MAFIA
SEYCHELLE IS.
AMIRANTE IS.
C. Delgado
COMORO IS.
Mozambique
ANGOLA
Benguela
Bihe
BENGUELA
N. WEST'N RHODESIA
S. WEST'N RHODESIA
Victoria Falls
Tete
Quilimane
Beira
Sofala
Antananarivo
Tamatave
MAURITIUS
RÉUNION
MADAGASCAR
ASCENSION I.
ST. HELENA
Mossamedes
R. Cunene
GERMAN SOUTH-WEST AFRICA
Windhuck
WALFISCH BAY
Schelpmansnoort
BECHUANALAND PROT.
Kalahari Desert
TRANSVAAL
Pretoria
Johannesburg
Lorenzo Marquez
C. Ste. Marie
NATAL
Durban
Bloemfontein
ORANGE RIVER COLONY
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
CAPE OF GOOD HOPE
Capetown
Cape of Good Hope
Port Elizabeth
East London
C. Agulhas
TROPIC OF CANCER
TROPIC OF CAPRICORN
EQUATOR
ATLANTIC OCEAN
INDIAN OCEAN

was often caused by refusal of medical attendance and disregard of sanitary regulations, it raised a great outcry in England, and naturally enhanced the bitterness which the Boers felt at their defeat and the loss of their independence. This, however, was speedily and pretty generally dispelled by wise liberality of the British, who gave and loaned generous sums to assist the Boers to repair the havoc which had been wrought. Moreover, by a stroke of enlightened statesmanship, self-government was restored to the Transvaal, in 1907, and to the Orange River Colony, in 1908. General Botha, the leader of the Boer forces, and General Smuts performed valiant service in reconciling their people to the situation. The next step was to unite the various South African States into a union under one central government, an undertaking that was completed in 1909. As is the case in Canada and Australia, there is a Governor-General, a Prime Minister, a Senate and a House of Assembly. In one respect, however, the arrangement differs decidedly from either Canada or Australia; with scarcely more than 1,000,000 whites and nearly 6,000,000 blacks it was felt that it would be safer to form a single strong Government than to establish a federation of the four existing States. The former States are now Provinces which merely administer their local affairs. Owing to rivalry among the various cities, the executive capital was established at Pretoria, the legislative capital at Cape Town, and the Court of Appeals at Bloemfontein. No distinction is made between the use of English and Dutch.

Post-union Problems. — Since the Union there has been a fair share of discontent, unrest and discord. General Botha, who became the first Premier under the Union, has been sharply opposed by General Hertzog and the anti-British party, chiefly on the ground of his enthusiasm for Imperial defense. Moreover, during the year 1913, South Africa was disturbed by serious strikes.[1] Since the black natives outnumber the whites nearly six to one, the Botha Government was so alive to the danger that it not only proclaimed martial law and called out troops but went to the length of deporting ten of the strike leaders

[1] Another difficulty has been raised by the treatment of East Indian indentured laborers. In 1913 the South African Parliament passed an Immigrants Regulation Act which continued a £3 tax imposed some years before by the Natal Government on such Indian laborers at the end of their term of service, and also restrictions on their movements from province to province. Thereupon, the East Indians began a policy of passive resistance, many being imprisoned for refusing to pay fines imposed on them. A further grievance arose from the fact that a Natal court decided that wives married according to Hindu or Mohammedan rites should have no status in the Province. The whole policy called forth strong protests from the Government of India.

to England. This procedure aroused an outcry among the English labor leaders which was only drowned in the thunders of the World War.

Egypt Previous to the British Occupation. — Egypt, that land of marvelous antiquity, furnishes a striking example of the manner in which stress of circumstances has not infrequently forced Great Britain reluctantly to extend her Imperial responsibilities. Egypt proper has an area of about three times the British Isles and a population of some twelve millions, of which over ten millions are native Egyptians of the Mohammedan faith. The country is watered by the Nile, and depends for its fertility not on rainfall but on the water obtained from the periodic overflow of the great river. The capital, situated just above the delta, is Cairo, and Alexandria is the seaport. South of Egypt is the Sudan (the land of the Blacks), with an area of a million square miles and three million inhabitants. Much might be said of Egypt's glorious but faded past under the long régime of the Pharaohs, of its successive subjection by the Persians, by Alexander, and by the Romans; but the interest for the student of modern affairs begins with Egypt's conquest by the Arab Saracens (the Christian name for Mohammedans) in 638, or, more particularly, after its conquest, in 1515, by the Sultan of Turkey, who two years later assumed the position of successor of Mahomet by proclaiming himself Caliph of Islam. For five centuries the Sultan continued as nominal overlord. After Napoleon's ambitious plans of conquest had been frustrated by Nelson and the French had been driven out,[1] Mehemet Ali, an Albanian adventurer, managed to thrust himself in as representative of the Porte, and eight years before his death, in 1849, secured a firman, or decree, from Constantinople recognizing as hereditary in his family the office of Governor, or Vali. Mehemet Ali disposed of his enemies with the bloodthirsty expeditiousness of the Oriental despot, but, albeit by ferocious rough-and-ready methods, he dispensed a fair degree of justice, and worked according to his lights to develop the resources of the land.

The British Purchase of the Suez Canal Shares and the Beginning of International Control. — It was the colossal extravagance of Ismail (1863–1879), one of his successors, who was allowed to assume the title of Khedive in 1866, that first brought about active European intervention in Egypt, the final result of which was the British occupation. Among the projects which Napoleon had been forced to abandon was one to cut a canal through the Isthmus of Suez. This was taken up by the French engineer, Ferdinand de Lesseps, who, in spite of the op-

[1] See above, p. 597.

position of Palmerston, succeeded (1856) in launching a company with a capital of £8,000,000, nearly half of which was subscribed by French capitalists. The Egyptian Government, which took up most of the remainder, ultimately sank more than £16,000,000 in the undertaking. The Suez Canal, opened 17 November, 1869, with great festivities, shortened the route from England to Bombay by 6000 miles and, in conjunction with the introduction of steamships, reduced the length of the journey from four months to three weeks. British interest in Egypt,[1] always great ever since the acquisition of India, now became vital. Ismail, after an orgy of lavishness, became bankrupt in 1875, having, as a result of personal prodigality, of internal improvements — made unduly costly by official graft and mismanagement — and of borrowing at ruinous rates, swelled the national debt from £3,000,000 to £89,000,000. In desperation he undertook to mortgage his Canal shares in Paris, whereupon, Disraeli, prompted by a wise suggestion from an English journalist, purchased the whole lot — 176,602 of the 400,000 originally issued — for the British Government. Negotiating the purchase on his own responsibility, he succeeded in inducing Parliament to ratify the step. The shares for which he paid slightly more than £4,000,000 are now worth over £20,000,000. The financial position of the Khedive was so hopeless that a *Caisse de la Dette*, or committee of bondholders, was set up in May, 1876, which was authorized to receive for foreign creditors the portion of the public revenues that the Powers forced the Khedive to devote to the payment of the interest on his debts. Later in the same year a scheme was formulated for placing the administration of Egyptian finances under the supervision of two commissioners, one French and one British. This Dual Control was first established on a satisfactory basis after it had been found necessary to depose Ismail in 1879. The system, however, lasted barely three years.

The Beginning of the British Occupation (1881–1882). — A crisis came in 1881 when the new Khedive was obliged to dismiss his Cabinet at the demand of a faction of the army who, besides having certain particular grievances, represented, or professed to represent, the anti-Turkish or patriotic Egyptian interest. What had begun as a "national" movement degenerated, under their guidance, into an anarchistic outburst against progressive administration, and an anti-Christian crusade. They were led by Arabi, "a colonel of peasant origin," who became War Minister, 5 February, 1882. In spite of a joint note from

[1] Nevertheless, Great Britain refused in 1844, and again in 1853, proposals of the Tsar to annex Egypt by way of compensation for allowing him to appropriate other parts of the Turkish dominions.

Great Britain and France, the Khedive was obliged to admit him to office and was threatened with death if he removed him. A grievous evidence of what might be expected under the new régime was a Mohammedan massacre of Christians at Alexandria, 11 June. France at first had been for joint Anglo-British intervention to suppress Arabi, while Great Britain favored action through the Porte; however, the overthrow of the French Cabinet which advocated a vigorous policy left the British to deal with the situation alone. When they found that Arabi was erecting batteries, they determined, 11 July, to bombard Alexandria, while the French fleet, already there, refused to participate and sailed away. Arabi was forced to abandon the city, and 13 September was defeated at Tel-el-Kebir and put to flight by a British army. Shortly after, a representative sent by the British Government framed and submitted to the British Cabinet a scheme for the reorganization of the Egyptian administration. At the request of the Egyptian Government the Dual Control came to an end in spite of French protests, though Gladstone and his Cabinet disclaimed all thought of a British protectorate and proposed to withdraw as soon as conditions warranted the step. But Great Britain, assuming the position of adviser, with Sir Evelyn Baring (later Lord Cromer) as Agent and Consul-General, acted as protector in fact if not in name, and remains in occupation to this day.[1]

The Sudan and Gordon at Khartum (1884). — The next crisis in Egyptian affairs was due to the situation in the Sudan, lying in the upper Nile valley to the south of Egypt. In 1881 a man rose up who proclaimed himself the Mahdi — the spiritual and temporal ruler whose coming the Mohammedans looked forward to in the last days. Declaring it his mission to drive the hated Egyptian power from the

[1] In December, 1914, as a consequence of Turkey's entrance in the World War on the German side, she finally went to the length of declaring a formal protectorate.

The rather complicated system of government previous to December, 1914, was as follows. The Khedive was a vassal of the Sultan to whom he paid tribute, but all his acts were supervised by the British Consul-General. There was a Legislative Council and Assembly — absorbed in one House by an Act of 1913 — consisting of the 6 Cabinet Ministers, 17 Government appointees, and 66 elective members. The revenues were divided into two parts; half went for the expenses of the Government and half for the foreign creditors, represented by the *Caisse de la Dette*. There were four groups of courts: the Courts of the Cadis to administer Mohammedan law relating to marriage and inheritance; the Native Tribunals dealing with criminal and civil cases; the Consular Courts — guaranteed by the Capitulations of the XVth and XVIth centuries — to try criminal suits of foreigners; and the Mixed Tribunals — dating from 1876 — representing fifteen Powers, in which civil suits involving natives and foreigners were adjudicated.

Sudan, to conquer their country, to overthrow their Turkish suzerain and to convert the whole world to his faith, which not only was opposed to Christianity but to orthodox Mohammedanism as well, he gathered about him a body of fanatical enthusiasts. Against them the English commander of the Egyptian army was unable to make headway, partly because of the disorganized state of the Egyptian Government and partly because Gladstone's Foreign Minister, Lord Granville, refused to assume any responsibility in the Sudan. When Baring protested that (since the Sudan was a dependency of the Khedive) it was impossible to separate Egyptian and Sudanese affairs, the Cabinet decided to abandon the country. After vain attempts had been made to relieve and withdraw the loyal garrison posted there, General Gordon, whose offer to undertake the task had been twice refused by Baring and the Egyptian Ministers, was sent out by the British Government. Considering that the mission was intended to be a peaceful one, the choice was most unhappy; Gordon was an erratic military genius and a religious enthusiast as well, who previously, as Governor-General for the Khedive in these regions, had made dire war on the slave-dealers, thus bitterly antagonizing the class now among the Mahdi's stanchest supporters. Moreover, arriving at Khartum in February, 1884, he finally decided to hold the city and "smash the Mahdi." But he was gradually hemmed in and his communications cut off.

The Failure to Relieve Him (1885). The Final Conquest of the Sudan (1898). — After months of delay the British Government finally sent a force to relieve him. Against the advice of men on the ground, General Wolseley, the commander, chose the long river route instead of the shorter road across the desert. He did at length consent to dispatch a column by way of the desert; but it was too late to procure camels, or adequate equipment and supplies. When the relieving force arrived within striking distance of Khartum, 27 January, 1885, the Mahdi was in possession and Gordon was dead. In the face of starvation and treachery within, as well as attacks from without, he held on magnificently for three hundred and seventeen days. The tardy arrival of the relieving force roused a storm of fury in England and proved the "death-blow of the Ministry," and the name of Gordon was cherished as that of a martyred hero. Nevertheless, the Sudan was abandoned. While the Mahdi only survived the taking of Khartum five months, the country was ruled for some years by his successor, an ex-slave-dealer, who committed sad havoc and almost depopulated it. Meantime, under the remarkable administration of Baring, who became Lord Cromer in 1901, Egypt was absolutely transformed. Finances were put on a sound footing, roads were built, and irrigation

was revolutionized by the Assuan dam begun in 1898. The army, too, was reformed. Its most notable achievement was the recovery of the Sudan in a campaign which lasted from 1896 to 1898 under Sir Herbert Kitchener, who was also assisted by British forces. The critical engagement leading to the recovery of Khartum was fought at Omdurman, 2 September, 1898.[1] By an agreement, concluded in January, 1899, the Government of the Sudan was placed under the sovereignty of Great Britain and the Khedive of Egypt. Military and civil control was vested in a Governor-General recommended by the British and appointed by the Khedive. Under the new régime the Sudan appears to be recovering from Mahdism and to be on the road to civilization and prosperity.

Cromer and Modern Egypt. — In addition to the financial and army reforms already enumerated, much has been done in Egypt toward improving the administration of justice, the condition of prisons, the state of public health, and the advancement of education. At first, progress in the latter field was painfully slow;[2] of late, however, the gain has been rapid. With the improvement of material conditions and the spread of education there has been an increasing demand for self-government. This new nationalism first became manifest about 1892 upon the death of Ismail's successor; stimulated by the strained relations between the British agency and the new Khedive and greatly fostered by the press, it was taken up by many young men of the better class, though chiefly among the Mohammedans. While much can be said for the movement from the standpoint of sentiment, unquestionably the country is better off under British than it could hope to be under native rule. Yet, as they grow ready for it, more and more of the government should be placed in native hands. The French, as they saw their Egyptian investments steadily increasing in value, gradually became reconciled to an indefinite British occupation, and, in 1904, formally agreed to demand no limit to its continuance. In 1907, Lord Cromer resigned after nearly a quarter of a century of labors, crowned by unique achievement.

The British Advance in India. — Since the passage of Pitt's India Bill in 1784[3] the British direct rule has been extended until it includes three fifths of the total area of 1,900,000 square miles and rather more than three quarters of a population which numbered 315,000,000 in

[1] About the same time, Major Marchand, entering from the west, occupied Fashoda for the French; but after delicate diplomatic negotiations he was induced to withdraw.

[2] According to the census of 1897 no less than 88 per cent of the males and 99½ per cent of the females were unable to read or write.

[3] See above, p. 575.

1911. There remain some 700 native States — less than a score of which are of any considerable size — all of which are under the supervision of British residents and enjoy British protection. Many reforms have been effected, though consequent encroachments upon native independence and native prejudice have been bitterly resented. Ill feeling was accentuated by various causes. Having once intervened, Great Britain and the East India Company were constantly obliged, often against their will, to conquer new territories in order to secure those which they already held, and sometimes to annex tribes who sought their protection. Moreover, the British administrators, while in general men of the best intentions, were often overbearing and maladroit. Lord Mornington, later Marquis of Wellesley, who went out as Governor-General in 1798, has been called the "second father of the Indian Empire," [1] owing to his activity in extending the British power and acquiring territory. Most of these acquisitions were due to the risings under Napoleonic influence in the south, to the disorders of various Maráthá chieftains who terrorized central India, and to the need of protecting the northern border against the aggressions of the Afghans. Wellesley resigned in 1805, when the Home Government ceased to support him against the Company.

The Reforms of Bentinck (1828–1835). — Neither the Government nor the Company was in favor of further territorial expansions; but the logic of events and the ambition of Governors resulted in annexations, protectorates and subsidiary treaties [2] at more or less regular intervals. Though the rights of native rulers were occasionally disregarded, intervention was, in most cases, prompted by disorder or oppression. One great step in the interest of peace was the breakup of the Maráthá Confederacy in 1818. The rule of Lord William Bentinck (1828–1835) was marked by great reforms. He abolished the *sati* (suttee) or the practice of burning Hindu widows on the funeral piles of their husbands, likewise he suppressed the *Thagí* (or thugs), a secret society of robbers and murderers. In addition, he greatly increased the Indian revenue, while at the same time reducing the expenses of the administration; he made English the official language of the country and sought to foster the education of the natives in English ways. While the Anglo-Indians resented his revision of the "batta," or official allowances, as well as his extension of the recently established custom of employing natives in the public service, his rule was, on the whole, peaceful and prosperous. Meantime, the functions of the Company had been greatly curtailed. In 1813 its

[1] Clive is known as "the father of the Indian Empire."

[2] By which a State paid subsidies in return for military protection.

trading monopoly was confined to China, in 1833 even that was taken away, and all that remained were such political administrative powers as had been provided for in the Act of 1784.

The Fatal Expedition to Afghanistan, the Sikh Wars, and the Aggressive Policy of Dalhousie. — Under Bentinck's successor the British met with a great humiliation. Russia was thus early seeking to extend her influence in Afghanistan, and Persia was assisting her advance. The British Governor-General suspected the Afghan Amir at Kabul of complicity, so, in October, 1838, he proclaimed the latter's deposition and set up in his place the representative of a rival line whom he supported by a British army. The natives submitted for a time; but, late in 1841, they rose in revolt, in consequence of which the British general signed, January, 1842, a humiliating treaty by which he agreed to evacuate Kabul. The retreat proved to be one of the most disastrous in British annals. Subjected to increasing attacks, only one man survived out of a force of 4500 men and 10,000 followers. A new British army relieved two garrisons which still held out, marched on Kabul, took the city, 16 September, 1842, recovered the surviving women and children — together with the married officers who by special exemption had not joined the retreat — and returned to India. In spite of this belated assertion of power the result was a sore blow to British prestige. The year 1843 was notable for the annexation of Sind — the country in the valley of the Lower Indus. This was an act of aggression on the part of the commanding general, who described it as a "very advantageous, useful and humane piece of rascality" and announced his victory with the words "*peccavi*, I have Sind." Two wars (1845–1846 and 1848–1849) — with the Sikhs, a powerful military and religious sect, organized into a great confederacy — resulted in the annexation of the Punjab, the region of the Upper Indus northeast of Sind. The second Sikh War was concluded during the governorship of the Earl of Dalhousie (1848–1856) who vastly extended the area of British rule by a series of notable annexations. An able, energetic ruler, his only defect was lack of imagination. Convinced that the British system was infinitely more enlightened and efficient than that of the natives, he failed to realize how it might run counter to their sentiments and prejudices. Perhaps his most momentous step was the annexation of Oudh, in February, 1856, where, it should be said, he followed the Company's wishes rather than his own. The native government was ineffective, oppressive and corrupt; on the other hand, the transaction was not only badly managed, but involved the revocation of Wellesley's treaty of 1801 with a Wazir whose successors had always been loyal to Great Britain. The appre-

INDIA IN 1857
British Dominions
Protected States
Independent States
French
Portuguese
ENGLISH MILES
0 100 200 300 400 500
CHINESE EMPIRE
HIMALAYA MOUNTAINS
BAY OF BENGAL
ARABIAN SEA
INDIAN OCEAN
RAJPOOTANA
OUDH
BHOOTAN
NAGPUR
DOMINIONS OF THE NIZAM
MYSORE
CEYLON
ANDAMAN ISLANDS
NICOBAR ISLANDS
LACCADIVE ISLANDS
MALDIVE ISLANDS
Jellalabad
Cabul
Peshawur
Lahore
Moultan
Meerut
Delhi
Ajmir
Gwalior
Hyderabad
Kurrachee
Lucknow
Cawnpore
Benares
Patna
Barhampore
Dacca
Chittagong
Calcutta
Chandernagore (French)
Cuttack
Baroda
Surat
Assaye
Aurungabad
Poonah
Bombay
Jeypar
Hyderabad
Bijapur
Goa (Portuguese)
Masulipatam
Madras
Pondicherry (French)
Karikal (Fr.)
Mahe (Fr.)
Tellicherry
Calicut
Cochin
Trichinopoly
Tanjore
Trincomalee
Kandy
Colombo
C. Comorin
Pegu
Martaban
Tenasserim
Amherst
Moulmein
Ava
Prome
Sangor
Nerbudda
Tapti
Godavery
Kistna
Penner
Cauvery
Coromandel Coast
Malabar Coast
Western Ghauts
Eastern Ghauts
Indus
Sutlej
Ganges
Brahmapootra
Irrawaddy
Hoogly
Mahanuddy
Suleiman Mts.
Bolan Pass
Khyber Pass
Sabraon
Ferozeshah
Aliwal
Sobraon
Moodkee
Ferozepore
Loodiana
Umballa
Thanesar
Kurnaul
Agra
Allygurh
Ferozabad
Etawah
Mutra
Jhansi
Allahabad
Saugor
Nagpore
Nuddea
Jessore
Dacca
Barrackpore
Serampore
Berhampore
Moorshedabad
Midnapore
Balasore
Cuttack
Ganjam
Vizagapatam
Rajahmundry
Ellore
Guntoor
Nellore
Ongole
Cuddapah
Bellary
Chittledroog
Seringapatam
Coimbatore
Dindigul
Madura
Tinnevelly
Palamcottah
Tuticorin
Aden
Muscat
Persian Gulf
Red Sea
Gulf of Cutch
Gulf of Manaar
Gulf of Martaban
Cambay
Salsette
Diu (Portuguese)
Daman (Portuguese)
Sattara
Kolapore
Belgaum
Darwar
Goa
Sholapore
Ahmednuggur
Candeish
Berar
Gondwana
Orissa
Circars
Northern Circars
Southern Circars
Hyderabad Dominions
Holkar's Dominions
Scindia's Dominions
Guicowar's Dominions
Rajpootana
Cutch
Guzerat
Malwa
Bundelcund
Rohilcund
Doab
Punjaub
Cashmere
Afghanistan
Beloochistan
Scinde
Candahar
Ghuznee
Herat
Cabul River
Indus
Sutlej
Ganges
Brahmapootra
Irrawaddy
Hoogly
Mahanuddy
Nerbudda
Tapti
Godavery
Kistna
Penner
Cauvery
Coromandel Coast
Malabar Coast
Western Ghauts
Eastern Ghauts
Suleiman Mts.
Bolan Pass
Khyber Pass
Sabraon
Ferozeshah
Aliwal
Sobraon
Moodkee
Ferozepore
Loodiana
Umballa
Thanesar
Kurnaul
Agra
Allygurh
Ferozabad
Etawah
Mutra
Jhansi
Allahabad
Saugor
Nagpore
Nuddea
Jessore
Dacca
Barrackpore
Serampore
Berhampore
Moorshedabad
Midnapore
Balasore
Cuttack
Ganjam
Vizagapatam
Rajahmundry
Ellore
Guntoor
Nellore
Ongole
Cuddapah
Bellary
Chittledroog
Seringapatam
Coimbatore
Dindigul
Madura
Tinnevelly
Palamcottah
Tuticorin
Aden
Muscat
Persian Gulf
Red Sea
Gulf of Cutch
Gulf of Manaar
Gulf of Martaban
Cambay
Salsette
Diu (Portuguese)
Daman (Portuguese)
Sattara
Kolapore
Belgaum
Darwar
Goa
Sholapore
Ahmednuggur
Candeish
Berar
Gondwana
Orissa
Circars
Northern Circars
Southern Circars
Hyderabad Dominions
Holkar's Dominions
Scindia's Dominions
Guicowar's Dominions
Rajpootana
Cutch
Guzerat
Malwa
Bundelcund
Rohilcund
Doab
Punjaub
Cashmere
Afghanistan
Beloochistan
Scinde
Candahar
Ghuznee
Herat
Cabul River
EQUATOR
70°
75°
80°
85°
90°
95°
35°
30°
25°
20°
15°
10°
5°
0°

hension it aroused among the other native princes was increased by the Governor-General's announcement that the British would take possession of all States where the ruler was without natural heirs, — a new policy quite at odds with a well-established Indian law and practice of adopting successors. Following the proclamation, several of the States of the former Maráthá Confederacy were taken over, and Nana Sahib, the adopted son of the ex-Peshwa, or former ruler of the Confederacy, was deprived of his pension. Also the Mogul at Delhi was informed that he could not hand on the titles and revenues which his degenerate line had so long enjoyed. All this contributed to prepare the way for the Indian Mutiny, which came as a sudden shock to the British people just after they had finished celebrating the centenary of Plassey, 23 June, 1857.

The Causes of the Indian Mutiny (1857). — The causes of the Mutiny were many and complex — "a combination of military grievances, national hatred and religious fanaticism" — which culminated suddenly against the English occupation of India. There were all sorts of elements of discontent fomented by busy agents of sedition. The innovations, reforms and inventions of more than two decades had aroused the superstitious fears of the people, especially of the Brahmans who cherished their caste system and their other traditions with peculiar jealousy. Owing to the activity of the missionaries, and the sympathy accorded them, perhaps too zealously, by many of the officials and soldiers, the belief got abroad that Christianity was to be imposed by force or trickery on the reluctant country. Then the time seemed peculiarly ripe. The miscarriages in Afghanistan had encouraged the disaffected to believe that their masters were not invulnerable; moreover, the Crimean War had been a heavy drain on British resources, and a conflict with China had begun to draw to a head before terms of peace had been concluded with Persia, whose Shah was united in a close religious bond with the Mohammedan Mogul at Delhi. Owing to these various wars, successive contingents had been withdrawn till only 45,000 Europeans remained in the Indian army, while the native troops aggregated nearly 300,000 — a disproportion of numbers well calculated to encourage disaffection.

In February, 1856, the masterful Dalhousie was succeeded by a man of a most conciliatory attitude, Viscount Canning, whose arrival, however, instead of averting the trouble, was followed by a series of measures which brought it to a head. The land system in Oudh was approximated to the English model, and many of the native Zamindars, who farmed the taxes of whole villages, were removed. The army was a hot-bed of discontent, most extreme in the Bengal army, where

the privates, who were Brahmins, or other high-caste Hindus, hated to render obedience to officers whom they regarded as inferiors. Formerly, they had been privileged over the Bombay and Madras armies — made up of more miscellaneous elements — by exemption from service beyond the seas. Canning, however, 1 September, 1856, issued a general service order which deprived them of the exemption; this was not only a blow at the caste system, but meant, since the Brahmins might not cook upon the "black water," if they were sent across to Burma, that they would have to subsist on parched grain. But the spark which finally caused the explosion resulted from the introduction, in place of the old musket, of a new rifle loaded with greased cartridges which had to be torn with the teeth before they were inserted to the gun barrel. Rumor declared that the grease was composed of cow's fat and pig's lard, which infuriated both the Mohammedans, to whom the pig was an unclean beast, and the Hindus, who worshiped the cow as sacred. In vain, the Government offered assurances that the rumor was untrue.

The Outbreak of the Mutiny (10 May, 1857). — In spite of mutinous outbreaks in more than one station during the spring of 1857, the authorities were slow to take alarm or to prepare for a crisis, when a little more activity at the start might have prevented the Mutiny from gaining dangerous headway. The first serious rising occurred at Meerut, about forty miles northeast of Delhi, where on Sunday, 10 May, 1857, a body of Sepoys forcibly rescued a group of their comrades who had been locked up for refusing to use the greased cartridges. After a night of slaughter they marched off to Delhi, which became the center to which body after body of Sepoys flocked after they had risen in arms. The rebels proclaimed the Mogul, a man over eighty years old, as Emperor, and proceeded to massacre all the English, men, women, and children, within their reach. The Mutiny had become a revolution. The disaffected regions were Oudh, Bengal, the Northwest Provinces, and parts of central India, though in this latter district most of the great potentates remained loyal. Southern India was not disturbed, while the Punjab, which occupied a very important strategic position in relation to the Northwest Provinces, was saved by the energy of two remarkable men, Robert Montgomery and John Lawrence. The breathless interest of the Mutiny has always centered about Delhi, Cawnpore, and Lucknow; but the fighting ranged over a vast area from the lower Ganges to the Punjab, not to speak of central India. Canning, once the danger was fully manifest, acted with the greatest promptness and energy; he caused troops to be hurried to the scene of action from every available point, from

England, from the Persian frontier, and he even intercepted a force on its way to China. However, he declared that he would not "govern in anger," and sought to show such mercy to the mutineers as to earn him from those who adopted more resentful methods the name of " Clemency " Canning.

The Massacre at Cawnpore, and the Siege of Lucknow. — The first efforts were directed toward the relief of Delhi. The approach from Calcutta was slow, because there was only one short piece of railway, one hundred and twenty miles in length, running from the city, while the roads were bad besides. Moreover, Delhi was defended by Sepoys trained in English fighting methods, who had a number of heavy cannon and were protected by strong thick walls, and one brave little army, after cutting their way through, proved too weak to attempt an attack; so, encamped outside to wait for reënforcements, they were besieged in their turn by another native force. Meanwhile, the danger was spreading rapidly. At Cawnpore, General Wheeler, an old man of seventy-four years, had been forced to take refuge in the English residency. It was in an untenable position, and after holding out as long as he could in the withering heat against the shot of the assailants, he made a treaty, 27 June, 1857, with Nana Sahib, who had arrived on the scene of action. Though he posed as the friend of the English, he had been nursing his grievances secretly and betrayed their confidence by ferocious treachery. Having granted the garrison a safe conduct to proceed down the Ganges to a place of security, he ordered them to be fired on just as they were setting off in boats. The men who survived this cold-blooded slaughter, except four who escaped, were taken back to Cawnpore and shot. The women were thrust into a small building where they endured frightful suffering for two weeks; when, on the night of 15 July, a relief force appeared, the infuriated Nana sent in a body of men who butchered all they could and threw all the rest, some of whom were still alive, into an adjoining well. Another storm center was Lucknow, the capital of the recently annexed province of Oudh. The commandant, Sir Henry Lawrence, brother of John, having foreseen the danger and prepared for it, conducted an heroic defense; but, about a month after the beginning of the attack, he was hit by a shell and survived only a few days. He had " tried to do his duty " was the only record of his achievement that he asked. For nearly three months not more than a thousand Europeans and seven hundred faithful natives held out against a body of assailants estimated at 60,000.

The First Relief of Lucknow (September, 1857). — The force which had arrived at Cawnpore in July consisted of some 1500 men, of whom

not more than 1200 were Europeans, and was led by Henry Havelock, who after forty-two years of faithful service had been intrusted with his first independent command. Leaving Calcutta in June he pressed on in spite of the burning heat. While unable to forestall the massacre, he defeated the rebels and put some of their number to death, though Nana Sahib escaped. On 20 July, Havelock started for Lucknow, less than a hundred miles away. His little band, however, was so weakened by sunstroke, cholera and dysentery, that he made slow progress, and about the beginning of September he was obliged to send a message to the besieged that he could not bring them the assistance he had promised. Two weeks later, Sir James Outram arrived with reënforcements; notwithstanding his commission to supersede Havelock, whose heroism had been quite ignored by the authorities, Outram generously insisted that his predecessor should remain in command until the relief of Lucknow was accomplished, and served under him as a volunteer. The combined forces reached the outskirts of Lucknow, 23 September, and after two days of hard fighting, forced their way in. They were not strong enough to raise the siege; but, thanks to their welcome reënforcements, the garrison was able to hold out until Sir Colin Campbell finally drove off the enemy in November.

The Recovery of Delhi (September, 1857). — Meantime, Delhi, which the original relief contingent had not been strong enough to assault, was recovered, largely through the efforts of two successive expeditions sent, regardless of the possible dangers of a Sikh rising or an Afghan invasion, by John Lawrence, from the Punjab. A general assault began 14 September; but it required days of hard fighting before the last gate of Delhi was taken. While the Emperor was spared to drag on his few remaining years in exile, his sons were put to death, to save them, so it was alleged, from being recovered by a Mohammedan mob. The month of September, notable for the relief of Lucknow and the taking of Delhi, marked the flood tide of the Indian Mutiny; nevertheless, it took months before the rebels were driven from Lucknow and before the various disaffected districts were finally reduced. Sir Colin Campbell, who had arrived, 17 August, as Commander-in-Chief, directed, henceforth, the military operations of the reënforcements which by autumn had begun to pour rapidly into the country. Havelock survived just long enough to witness Sir Colin's completion of the relief of Lucknow.

Final Suppression of the Mutiny (1858). — Partly owing to the extremely cautious methods of Sir Colin, the conquest of Oudh occupied nearly all the year 1858, and it was not until the beginning of 1859

that the last vestiges of the Mutiny had been stamped out. In spite of the merciful intentions of "Clemency" Canning, a grave sense of peril, resentment, and a desire to make examples to serve as a warning for the future, resulted in furious reprisals. Many were summarily shot — some blown to pieces at the mouths of cannon — while others were executed after trials in which very scant justice was shown.

The Powers of the East India Company Transferred to the Crown (1858). — Meantime, the remaining powers of the East India, or "John" Company, as it was popularly called, had been transferred to the Crown. Early in 1858 the question of the government of India had come up for discussion in Parliament. The existing system was loudly criticized on two grounds: (1) divided authority, and (2) the anomaly of allowing a mercantile company to share in the control of the Empire. The Directors presented a remarkable petition declaring that the acts of aggression which contributed to the Mutiny were in contradiction to the Company's traditional policy, and arguing that if the Government took over the patronage as well as the remaining political powers of the Company, the whole administration of India would become the football of politics. Nevertheless, the system of dual control was needlessly complicated, and, after some delay, a bill was finally passed 3 August, 1858, vesting the sole sovereignty in the Crown, represented in England by a Secretary of State for India responsible to Parliament. Since then, various measures have modified somewhat the system then adopted, usually with the view of giving the natives an increased participation in affairs. According to the arrangement existing previous to December, 1919, the Secretary of State was assisted in England by a Council which might be as large as fourteen, the members of which were appointed nominally by the Crown, really by the administration in power, and, since 1907, including two native Indians. In India, the Governor-General, or Viceroy as he is now commonly called, had an appointed Executive Council of six in which, since 1909, one native member was included. To these six might be added the Commander-in-Chief of the Indian army, who ranks as an extraordinary member. Moreover, there was a Legislative Council comprised of the Executive Council plus certain additional members not to exceed sixty. About half of these were elected directly or indirectly to represent various classes and interests, landholders, professional classes, merchants, Mohammedans and Hindus. The remainder were appointed. While there was a large native element which had a chance to make itself heard, there was always a slight official majority for the Government which, as a matter of fact, had the initiative, and controlled the making and administering of the laws. On the other hand, while the gen-

eral principles of English law prevailed, native law and custom, notably Hindu and Mohammedan, were still in vogue in many fields, particularly in the family law, such as rules of succession and inheritance. Natives were eligible for judicial office, and, except for the higher positions, about one thousand in number, occupied practically all branches of the civil service. While the government was one for the people rather than by the people, those in control were chosen by the rigid test of merit, and are responsible, either personally or through their superiors, to the British Parliament, famous among the world's representative bodies for its alertness and democracy.

Recent Indian History. — An evidence of Disraeli's Imperial imagination was the Royal Titles Bill of 1876 by which the Queen was declared Empress of India, a measure greeted by the natives with intense enthusiasm. In 1878 the British became involved in a war in Afghanistan in another attempt to check the forward policy of Russia, who had induced the Amir to admit a Russian resident. Instead of trying to induce the Russians to withdraw, Disraeli insisted on forcing the Amir to accept a new scientific frontier and to admit a British resident; in other words, he entered on a policy of aggression for the greater security of India. Less than six weeks after his arrival at Kabul, the Resident was attacked and killed by disaffected Afghans, whereupon General Roberts was dispatched to Kabul and occupied the city 10 October, 1879. Several were executed by way of reprisal and Afghanistan was divided between two rulers, but complete subjugation of the northern part which was contemplated by the Viceroy of India was defeated by the advent of a Liberal Administration in 1880. Later, the storm center of Russian and British rivalry shifted to Persia. Several factors, however, contributed in the course of time to transform Anglo-Russian hostility into an Anglo-Russian agreement. For one thing, the defeat of Russia by Japan in the war of 1904–1905 broke the tradition of Russian invincibility; moreover, the rise of Japanese power brought the British to realize that they could utilize Japan's increasing strength to counterbalance the weight of their old enemy in the East.[1] The third factor was the activity of Germany, who began,

[1] Consequently, in 1902, Great Britain concluded a treaty with Japan for the maintenance of peace and order in the far East, providing that if either Power went to war in the defense of its interests, the other would remain neutral, and that if either were attacked by more than one foreign enemy, the other would come to its assistance. This treaty was expanded into a formal alliance, 27 September, 1905, by which the maintenance of the territorial rights of Japan in Korea and of Great Britain in India were mutually guaranteed, as well as the integrity of China and the policy of the open door. On 14 July, 1911, this alliance was revised and renewed, this time with the concurrence of the British Dominions.

not long after the accession of William II, to secure a predominating influence in Turkey and to develop a design controlling a route through Asia Minor to the head of the Persian Gulf. Accordingly, in 1907, Russia and Great Britain came to an agreement by which Persia was divided into three zones: a Russian sphere of influence was recognized in the north, a British in the south, and the third was left neutral. Differences were also adjusted in Afghanistan and Tibet.

The Indian Problem. — Although, naturally, she has had her own interests to serve, Great Britain has protected India in peace from foreign aggression and, except for occasional outbreaks, from the onslaught of border tribes. Moreover, she has made considerable and persistent efforts to develop the resources of the land. For example, out of a debt which stood at £240,000,000 in 1911, £195,000,000 had been spent for railroads and irrigation. At the eve of the World War India was more prosperous than at any time in her history, with industries developing, wages rising, wealth increasing and laborers in great demand. Unhappily, this prosperity, which owes so much to the enlightened efforts of the British, is only relative. There is still a pathetic amount of poverty, ignorance, hunger, and disease. While there are five universities and not a little has been done for the education of the masses, less than 1 per cent of the females, 10 per cent of the males, and 25 per cent of the children of school age can read and write. But the British have worked against tremendous obstacles, they found hordes of inert people generally opposed to education, exploited by native princes and tax farmers, exposed to devastating attacks of warlike tribes and to periodic famine due to lack of transportation, to defective rainfall and to the great congestion of population in certain areas. It is a sad fact that famines have been lamentably frequent, even in recent years, but valuable lessons have been learned from experience, and the Government has made heroic efforts to cope with the evil on humane and scientific principles formulated by commissions of inquiry. Aside from remission of revenue and charitable donations at emergencies, a special famine insurance fund has been established as well as other intelligent measures of relief. "Now," it was stated, in 1913, by a competent authority, "the administration of the famine relief has been reduced to a highly organized system which is being constantly improved, and the fine railway system, which we have created, enables food to be transported to the stricken areas to an extent that was formerly impossible. Famines will inevitably afflict the people of India, but the loss and suffering have been infinitely mitigated, and what remains is mainly due to inherited habits and

customs, which, for a time at least, will continue to militate against the promptitude and completion of the relief measures." Attempts to deal with the plague, another deadly scourge, have been less successful, because "it was often found impossible to employ preventative measures recommended by science, owing to the panic of the native population, and their unconquerable opposition to isolation, hospitals, house-to-house visitations, segregation camps, and inoculation." Some of these difficulties have been fomented by the "incendiary writing of the vernacular press," — a fruitful and perplexing source of discontent and agitation.

There exist, amidst the teeming hordes of India, a million or so more or less highly educated natives, among them forward aspiring spirits who resent the dependent state of their people and demand complete self-government for their country. While theirs is a legitimate aspiration, as a future possibility, the impartial observer must consider that these extreme nationalists err in idealizing the happy prosperous state of India before the British occupation, that they fail to conceive the insuperable obstacles to an immediate realization of their ambition, and that some at least have been worked on by German propaganda to overthrow the existing system by assassination, as well as organized revolt. Granted that a few are competent to rule, — and many are dreamy idealists with little capacity for practical administration — who could choose them and what common harmonious basis of representation could be devised? "India is not a nation but a congeries of races and tribes exhibiting the most varied characteristics of language, religion, material civilization and social type." There are no less than 230 languages, more than 20 of which are spoken by over 1,000,000 each, while Hindi, the most numerous of all, is spoken by not more than one quarter the total population. Then there are strong racial, religious and social antagonisms — the warlike men of the Punjab have the utmost contempt for the peaceful intelligent Bengali, while a Mohammedan landowner regards a coolie much as a Southern planter regards a negro. As to religion, there are more than 200,000,000 Hindus, and, among its derivatives, 3,000,000 Sikhs and about 10,000,000 Buddhists, the latter practically confined to Burma; there are nearly 70,000,000 Mohammedans, and less than 4,000,000 Christians. The Hindus, the most numerous, are not only made up of various sects but include some sixty-nine castes, ranging from the Brahmans and the Rajputs to the lowest orders; they not only cannot intermarry or associate on terms of intimacy, but the higher sort are polluted by contact or even close proximity with the lower, though travel has done something to modify such extreme aloofness. While the Hindus are

Williams Engraving Co., N.Y.

in general the best educated, the Mohammedans have qualities making them most capable for ruling. A native once told the late Lord Roberts that to withdraw the British rule would be like opening the doors of the cages in a menagerie and that the tiger who overcame the rest would be the Mohammedan from the north. Nevertheless, of late years, there has been a strong nationalistic movement on the part of a group of progressive Hindus who believe that even "good government is no substitute for self-government." Their mouthpiece is the Indian National Congress which, since 1885, has held annual meetings. Even within this body there have arisen sharp conflicts between the extremists who are impatient for immediate results and those who realize that preparation for self-government must, perforce, be a plant of slow growth. Great Britain has committed blunders and even worse in her administration, many of which have been most vigorously denounced by critics among their own people; many of her merchants and officials have shown a stolid indifference and lack of appreciation of native customs and prejudices, others, with the best of intentions, have failed in this respect, but, on the whole, the British administration has been a marvel of wise achievement. Since immediate self-government would result in incalculable turmoil and confusion, the best hope for the immediate future would seem to lie in the development of policies already in process — further instruction of officials in the language and customs of leading Indian peoples, a more extensive promotion of their industry, commerce and agriculture,[1] increased education of natives in the English language, and enlarged representation in the legislative councils.

The Imperial Problem. — Such is the British Empire at the beginning of the twentieth century. The problem of administering this vast extent of territory, scattered over the globe and inhabited by less than 70,000,000 whites and more than 360,000,000 non-European people of distinct traditions and sentiments, is a complex and formidable one. It has been rendered easier from the fact that, in a considerable part of the expansion, extension of commerce and colonization has been a factor as potent as military force. So far as possible, too, Englishmen have been given an opportunity to practice self-government in their new homes, and "to train subject peoples for the discharges of similar responsibilities." Where responsible government has been impossible, efforts have been made, in the last half century,

[1] At last, Great Britain, stimulated no doubt by a concerted international movement, put a stop to an old scandal, by announcing, May, 1913, that the Indo-China opium traffic was ended. This imposed upon the Indian Government the heavy burden of meeting a loss in revenue estimated at £4,000,000 a year.

to provide for effective administration by civil servants whose merits have been tested by examination. While British statesmen, from the generation following the American Revolution up to fifty or sixty years ago, expected and even wished for a sundering of the Imperial dominions — much to the distress of loyal Canadians and Australians — a great change has taken place, especially in the last generation. The British people, formerly ignorant and indifferent in all that concerned Imperial questions, are now — owing in no small degree to the vision and eloquence of Disraeli — enthusiastic and active. Conferences of Colonial Ministers, beginning at London during the Jubilee of 1887, have done much to draw the Colonies to the Mother Country. The aid furnished by Canada and Australia in the Sudan campaign of 1885 and in the Boer War, the penny post, the improved steam communications, and the cable to Australia have been additional links. The Colonial Conferences — known since 1907 as Imperial Conferences — have now become regular institutions meeting every four years and have discussed such vital questions as Imperial defense. And in the intervals of their meeting a permanent Imperial secretarial staff is in constant session at London under the supervision of the Colonial Secretary to keep the Dominions informed of all matters of common concern that may come up at future conferences. The League of Empire [1] has been active throughout the British Dominions for the furtherance of education in Imperial concerns. Although the prospect of a federation, with a common Imperial Cabinet and Parliament, was widely discussed during the last years of the nineteenth and the first years of the present century, the trouble of adjusting a fair system of representation between the Mother Country and the Colonies with their scanty white population, the enormous distances, the difficulty of keeping overseas representatives in touch with their constituents, the fact that Great Britain clings to free trade while Canada and Australia continue to favor protection, as well as their desire and that of South Africa to restrict the immigration of dark-skinned folk, and the question as to whether the Self-governing Colonies should be drawn into European complications except of their own free will, have combined to render the likelihood of a federal Parliament well-nigh out of the question. But the bonds of unity, based on community of interest and policy, have become steadily stronger, particularly in view of the supreme efforts and sacrifices arising from the World War. All indications seem

[1] Another active organization is the Royal Colonial Institute, founded in 1868, to promote the cause of "United Empire." The Imperial Federation League, started in 1884, was dissolved ten years later, without effecting its particular purpose, though it achieved much in educating people to think imperially.

to point to a British Commonwealth of Nations with a stronger, more representative and more permanent central Cabinet.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

The Empire. H. E. Egerton, *A Short History of British Colonial Policy, 1783–1915* (5th ed., 1918). E. G. Hawke, *The British Empire and its History* (1911). A. W. Jose, *The Growth of Empire* (1913). C. F. Lavell and C. E. Payne, *Imperial England* (1918). Sir C. V. Lucas, *The British Empire* (1915). A. F. Pollard, ed., *The British Empire, its Past, its Present, and its Future* (1909). A. P. Newton, *The Old Empire and the New* (1917). Lord Cromer, *Ancient and Modern Imperialism* (1910). A. J. Herbertson and O. J. R. Howarth, *The Oxford Survey of the British Empire* (6 vols., 1914). Sir C. V. Lucas, ed., *Historical Geography of the British Colonies* (6 vols., new ed. 1915). Sir W. J. Ashley, *The British Dominions, their Present Commercial and Industrial Condition* (1911). A. B. Keith, *Selected Speeches and Documents on British Colonial Policy* (2 vols., 1918). R. Jebb, *The Imperial Conference* (2 vols., 1911). Sir Charles Dilke, *Problems of Greater Britain* (1890). G. R. Parkin, *Imperial Federation* (1913). *An Analysis of the System of Government throughout the British Empire* (1912). H. E. Egerton, *Federations and Unions within the British Empire* (1911). Edward Jenks, *The Government of the British Empire* (1918). A. B. Keith, *Responsible Government in the Dominions* (3 vols., 1912), and *Imperial Unity and the Dominions* (1916). J. E. Barker, *The Great Problems of British Statesmanship* (1918). Lionel Curtis, *Problems of the Commonwealth* (1917). A. W. Tilby, *The British in the Tropics, 1527–1910* (1912).

Canada. Durham, The Earl of, *Report on the Affairs of British North America, 1839*, Sir C. V. Lucas ed. (3 vols., 1912). A. G. Bradley, *The Making of Canada* (1908). Sir J. G. Bourinot, *Canada* (1897) and *Canada under British Rule, 1760–1900* (1900). George Bryce, *A Short History of the Canadian People* (2d ed., 1914). G. M. Wrong, "The Constitutional Development of Canada," *Roy. Hist. Soc. Trans.*, 4th series, vol. I, 236–253. G. M. Wrong *et al.*, *The Federation of Canada, 1867–1917* (four lectures, 1917). T. Hodgkin, *British and American Diplomacy Affecting Canada* (1900). *Cambridge Modern History*, X, XI, XII and bibliographies.

Anglo-American relations. John Bigelow, *Breaches of Anglo-American Treaties* (1917). W. A. Dunning, *The British Empire and the United States* (1914). A. C. McLaughlin, *America and Britain* (1919). Mary W. Williams, *Anglo-American Isthmian Diplomacy, 1815–1914* (1914). S. C. Johnson, *History of Emigration from the United Kingdom to North America, 1763–1912* (1913). Sinclair Kennedy, *The Pan-Angles* (1915). E. D. Adams, *Great Britain, America, and Democracy* (1919). O. Wister, *A Straight Deal or the Ancient Grudge* (1920).

Australia and New Zealand. E. G. Wakefield, *A View of the Art of Colonization* (1849, new ed., 1914). A. W. Jose, *A History of Australasia* (1918). Ernest Scott, *A Short History of Australia* (1917). W. T. Reeves,

State Experiments in Australia and New Zealand (1902). A. Siegfried, *Democracy in New Zealand* (1914).

South Africa. H. A. Gibbons, *The New Map of Africa, 1900–1916* (1916). Dorothea Fairbridge, *History of South Africa* (1918). G. M. Theal, *South Africa* (1917). L. S. Amery, "The Constitutional Development of South Africa," *Roy. Hist. Soc. Trans.*, 4th series, vol. I, 218–236. W. B. Worsfold, *The Union of South Africa* (1912). James, Viscount Bryce, *Impressions of South Africa* (1897), and *Britain and Boer* (1900). Sir A. C. Doyle, *The War in South Africa* (1902) and *The Great Boer War* (1902). J. A. Hobson, *The War in South Africa* (1900). R. G. Campbell, *Neutral Rights and Obligations in the Anglo-Boer War* (1908). G. L. LeSueur, *Cecil Rhodes, the Man and His Work* (1914). H. Spender, *General Botha* (1917). W. Levi, *Jan Smuts* (1917).

Egypt. W. B. Worsfold, *The Story of Egypt* (n. d.). A. E. P. B. Weigall, *Egypt from 1798 to 1914* (1915). Lord Cromer, *Modern Egypt* (2 vols., 1908), and *Abbas II* (1915). W. L. Balls, *Egypt of the Egyptians* (1916). Sidney Low, *Egypt in Transition* (1914). *Cambridge Modern History*, XII, ch. XV.

India. Sir Alfred Lyall, *The Rise and Expansion of the British Dominion in India* (4th ed., 1907). Sir W. W. Hunter, *Brief History of the Indian Peoples* (23d ed. 1903). L. J. Trotter, *History of India* (rev. W. H. Hutton, 1917). V. A. Smith, *The Oxford History of India* (1919). Sir T. W. Holderness, *People and Problems of India* (1911). Sir Courtney Ilbert, *The Government of India* (1915). M. J. Chailley, *Administrative Problems of British India* (1910). Sir G. Strachey, *India, its Administration and Progress* (4th ed., 1911). V. Chirol, *Indian Unrest* (1910). The Mutiny is treated in most of the general histories; for bibliography see Low and Sanders, pp. 497–499, and *Cambridge Modern History*, XI, pp. 965–967; the standard work is Sir John Kaye's *Sepoy War* (3 vols., 1864–76) completed by G. B. Malleson (1878–80); for a briefer work see T. Rice Holmes (5th ed., 1898). *The Imperial Gazetteer of India* is a mine of information relating to the country. For special topics, see Sir T. Morison, *The Economic Transition in India* (1911); Sir Wm. Lee-Warner, *The Native States of India* (1911); A. H. Benton, *Indian Moral Instruction and Caste Problems* (1917); E. W. Hopkins, *The Religions of India* (1896); J. B. Pratt, *India and its Faiths* (1916); and *Studies in Indian Life and Sentiment.* Among the works dealing with conditions and events since the outbreak of the Great War are: The Aga Khan, *India in Transition* (1919); Wm. Archer, *India and the Future* (1918); Lovat-Fraser, *India under Lord Curzon and After* (1918); DeWitt Mackenzie, *The Awakening of India* (1917); K. V. Rao, *The Future Government of India* (1918); V. A. Smith, *Indian Constitutional Reform* (1919); F. B. Fisher and G. M. Williams, *India's Silent Resolution* (1919). H. A. Gibbons, *The New Map of Asia* (1919), and H. M. Hyndman, *The Awakening of Asia* (1919), are both hostile in their attitude toward the British administration. Lajpat Rai, *Young India* (1916), *England's Debt to India* (1918) and *India and the Future* (1919), the works of a fiery extremist.

The *Round Table*, a quarterly devoted primarily to the British Empire, is invaluable for current problems.

CHAPTER LVIII

BRITISH FOREIGN RELATIONS WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO GERMANY AND THE CAUSES OF THE WORLD WAR (1870–1914)

Great Britain's "Splendid Isolation." — The death of Palmerston, in 1865, was followed by a long period during which the British foreign policy was generally one of aloofness from Continental affairs. The Liberals, dominated until his retirement in 1894 by the masterful personality of Gladstone, were interested primarily in domestic progress, and, though, with their leader, they raised their voices from time to time in behalf of oppressed nationalities, they aimed, as far as possible, to pursue their course unhampered by European complications. Disraeli, so long as he led the Conservative party, applied his spacious imagination mainly to popularizing the idea of Imperialism and fostering the British overseas dominion. "England," he declared so early as 1866, "has outgrown the European Continent. . . . Her position is no longer that of a mere European Power. England is the metropolis of a great maritime Empire, extending to the boundaries of the furthest ocean, though she is as ready and as willing, even, to interfere as in the old days when the necessity of her position requires it." Salisbury, his successor, though quick enough to take a firm stand whenever British interests or honor seemed to be threatened, assumed as his guiding aim the maintenance of the peace of Europe. With rare foresight he came to realize that antagonism to Russia which led to more than one crisis, even during his own time, was "the superstition of an antiquated diplomacy." It was the menace of Germany that finally brought Great Britain again into the European arena. For two centuries British policy has been a reasonably consistent one — to oppose any attempt to overthrow the balance of power, and, furthermore, to protect her Empire. Hence, she has fought the France of Louis XIV and Napoleon, as well as Russia and Germany. Naturally pursuing her own interests, in the main, nevertheless, high moral issues, among them the cause of oppressed nationalities, have made a powerful appeal to her people. No doubt

she has been a party to treaties and measures not always defensible; but her policy has of late been far from aggressive, while she has shown a rare constancy in the maintenance of treaty obligations.

Bismarck's Predominance in Europe. — For twenty years following the Franco-Prussian War, Bismarck remained Chancellor of the German Empire, which — with Prussia as the dominating element — his calculating and ruthless policy of blood and iron had created. Though he assumed the position of leader in the councils of Europe, he had no mind for further conquests, either in Europe, or, at least for the time being, beyond its confines. Germany he regarded as a "satiated State," and, besides, he had plenty of pressing problems to occupy him nearer at hand.

European Relations. The League of the Three Emperors. — While he was always ready to play one Power against another when need arose, Bismarck's primary aim was to cultivate such friendly relations and to make such diplomatic combinations as would keep France isolated. Thus, in 1872, he concluded an informal agreement with Austria and Russia, known as the League of the Three Emperors or *Drei Kaiserbund*. Both his allies were opposed to Great Britain's support of Turkey; furthermore, the Tsar was particularly affrighted at the "pernicious example given by the growing republicanism and socialism in England." Such was the anti-British attitude of Austria and Russia in the early seventies. Anglo-French and Anglo-German relations were also not without disquieting features. Bismarck's exposure of the designs on Belgium which he had tempted Napoleon III to urge, had contributed not a little to harden the British against the French at the beginning of the Franco-Prussian War, while Queen Victoria's ineffectual protest against the pitiless siege of Paris had aroused German resentment without to any considerable degree reconciling the French. Bismarck, himself, cherishing no Imperial ambitions and recognizing that the British had no aggressive intentions in Europe, was generally inclined to cultivate friendly relations with Great Britain. However, aside from the feeling of his Russian and Austrian allies and the hostile attitude of the German press, his path was strewn with further difficulties. British Ministers, while peacefully inclined, distrusted him and viewed him coldly; moreover — and here he revealed the typical German autocrat — he complained of the "absolute impossibility of confidential intercourse, in consequence of the indiscretions of English statesmen in their communications to Parliament, and the absence of security in alliances, for which the Crown is not answerable in England, but only the fleeting Cabinets of the day." Circumstances soon arose that seriously weak-

ened the Russo-German tie, though the alliance was never completely broken during Bismarck's Chancellorship.

A New Crisis in the Near East. — One such crisis, which dragged Great Britain again into the whirlpool of European politics, was pregnant in results; for it contributed not only to alienate Russia from Germany, but to tighten the Austro-German alliance and to open the way for a rivalry of pan-Germanism and pan-Slavism in the Balkans which has been such a factor in bringing about the recent World War. The trouble began, in 1875, with a revolt in the provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Though egged on by Russia and Austria, they had suffered real grievances at the hands of Turkish officials, religious oppression and financial extortion as well. The provisions of the Treaty of 1856 had been violated in almost every conceivable way: the Porte had not kept its promise of ameliorating the lot of the Christians under its rule, Russia had not been excluded from the Black Sea, and endless other causes of friction existed to invite trouble. The three Powers of Austria, Russia, and Prussia were insistent that Turkey should be made to reform her administration by force of arms if necessary. The British Ministers, however, would go no further than to urge reform upon the Sultan, still believing in the possibility of the regeneration of Turkey, a delusion which their jealousy of Russia contributed to nourish. Depending upon support of Disraeli (now Lord Beaconsfield), the Turks pursued a policy of suave evasion. On 5 May, 1876, a body of Mohammedan fanatics rose at Salonika; among their victims were the French and German consuls, and although British, French, and German fleets were hurried to the scene of action the disorders continued. During the summer of 1876, Serbia and Montenegro joined in the war. About the same time an insurrection broke out in Bulgaria, and was suppressed by the Turks with such atrocities as to arouse a fury of indignation in England, especially among the Liberals. Gladstone, emerging from his retirement, published a pamphlet on the *Bulgarian Horrors and the Question of the East*, and made speeches of fiery eloquence in behalf of the oppressed. Beaconsfield, who had little sympathy for the Christians in the Turkish provinces and a consuming dread of Russia, accused his rival of making political capital out of the situation, referring to him as a "designing politician," seeking "to further his own sinister ends."

The Russo-Turkish War (1877–1878). — Beaconsfield of course dominated the Cabinet, and it was only the opposition of the British Government to the use of force that held Russia back. At length a conference of the Powers was arranged at Constantinople. Lord Salisbury, the British representative, solemnly informed the Sultan

that if he failed to observe the warning of the Powers and allowed maladministration to continue, the responsibility would rest with the Porte; but the effect of these weighty words was counterbalanced by the attitude of Beaconsfield, and the Turks, thereby encouraged to count on British support, rejected a protocol framed by the Conference voicing the demands of the Powers. As a consequence, Russia declared war on Turkey, 24 April, 1877. For months the conflict was waged with varying fortune until, in December, the power of the Turkish resistance was broken. In January, 1878, the Russian troops occupied Adrianople; but, though they were within striking distance of Constantinople, their energies were, for the moment, well-nigh exhausted. There were three parties in England. At one extreme were those who regarded the welfare of the Christian subjects of the Porte as a matter of secondary importance and insisted upon the maintenance of the integrity of Turkey as a necessary barrier against Russian aggrandizement. Opposed to them was the party who felt that the maintenance of the Ottoman Empire in Europe was a disgrace to Christendom, and that it must be destroyed at all hazards. Between these extremes was the great mass of men who were ashamed of the Turkish atrocities, but who, nevertheless, could not bring themselves to support the armed intervention of Russia. There were sharp differences of opinion in the Cabinet as well. The policy of the Foreign Minister was to hold aloof without coercing or assisting Turkey, so long as the British interests in the Suez, in Egypt, in the Persian Gulf, or anywhere along the route to India, were not affected. With some difficulty he maintained this policy until the Russians advanced on Constantinople, when, as a counterpoise, a British fleet was sent to the Ægean. It sailed through the Dardanelles, and took up a position near the Turkish capital. On 3 March, the Russians extorted from their vanquished enemy the Treaty of San Stefano.

The Treaty of San Stefano (1878). — The treaty provided among other things for: (1) the creation of an autonomous vassal principality of Bulgaria, extending from the Danube on the north and the Black Sea on the east to the Ægean on the south, and so big as not only to menace the integrity of Turkey, but practically to swallow up Macedonia, which the Greeks burned to recover; (2) the independence of Serbia, Montenegro, and Rumania;[1] and (3) the autonomy of Bosnia and Herzegovina under Christian governors. The plan of a "big Bulgaria" was opposed strenuously both by the Mussulmans and by the Greeks. Great Britain, who favored their protests, on the

[1] Formed by the union, between 1859 and 1866, of the ancient provinces of Moldavia and Wallachia.

ground that it would practically amount to the creation of a Russian province dominating the Balkan peninsula,[1] only later came to recognize that the formation of strong and independent buffer States in the Balkans might prove just as effective a check on the expansion of Russia as would the preservation of the integrity of Turkey. Austria, who had apparently received a promise from Russia, that she might occupy the provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina, was also dissatisfied. As a result, the Congress of Berlin was arranged, where, owing mainly to the insistence of Great Britain, the whole treaty was reviewed. Although it was unprecedented for a Prime Minister to take such a step, Beaconsfield went in person to Berlin.[2]

The Congress of Berlin (1878). — The chief work of the Congress, which sat from 13 June to 13 July, under the presidency of Bismarck, was to alter two provisions of the Treaty of San Stefano. Austria was allowed to occupy and administer Bosnia and Herzegovina. Also, the "big Bulgaria" was cut down to a district north of the Balkans. South of the mountains was formed the province of Eastern Rumelia, under the control of the Sultan but administered by a Christian Governor-General named by the Porte with the assent of the Powers. Macedonia, too, was excluded from the Bulgaria contemplated by the Russian arrangement, handed back to the Sultan, and, in spite of promised reforms, remained groaning under Turkish oppression and constantly in revolt until 1913. Beaconsfield on his return to England was received with tremendous enthusiasm, and declared complacently that he had obtained "peace with honor." But the achievement which he contemplated with the greatest pride was not destined to survive a decade; for, in 1885, Eastern Rumelia, his pet creation, quietly proclaimed its union with Bulgaria. Serbia, backed by Austria, waged a war in vain to prevent it, and the arrangement was sanctioned by Salisbury, the successor of Beaconsfield as head of the Conservative party. Bulgaria, resenting Russian domination in her affairs, soon broke with her protector, a result which might have been precipitated sooner if she had got the strength which she desired in 1878. Great Britain, however, had accomplished something by showing the Russians that they could not presume to adjust the affairs of the Near

[1] Beaconsfield may also have been influenced by the fear that the resentment of the Mohammedan subjects of the British would be roused by so great a reduction of the boundaries of the leading Moslem State.

[2] Meantime, 4 June, Great Britain, nine days before the opening of the Berlin Congress, had concluded a convention with Turkey by which she received the island of Cyprus in return for an agreement to protect the Asiatic provinces of the Porte from Russian attack, on condition that the Sultan "introduce necessary reforms therein."

East unopposed; but even the heirs of Beaconsfield's policy came to recognize that there was a more effectual way of holding the Muscovite power in check, than by a futile attempt to sustain the integrity of Turkey in Europe.

The Triple Alliance (1879–1882). — Although Bismarck protested that he merely acted the part of an "honest broker" at the Congress of Berlin, his support of Austria and Great Britain against the efforts of Russia to champion the Slavs, and to extend Muscovite influence in the Balkans, put a serious strain on Russo-German relations. To secure Germany against a possible Russian attack — and also against France, which he regarded as far less dangerous — the German Chancellor arranged with Austria, in October, 1879, a Dual Alliance, that in 1882 he extended into a Triple Alliance by the inclusion of Italy, thus thrusting a wedge between a possible junction of France and Russia by way of the Mediterranean, as well as securing a possible avenue of attack on the French border. Not content with the security aimed at by the Triple Alliance, Bismarck also undertook to tie Russia's hand against a possible combination with France by the so-called policy of "re-insurance." It required no little adroitness to enter into treaty relations with a Power against which he had already effected a combination, even if only defensive in character, particularly since he had offended that Power by his pro-Austrian and anti-Russian attitude in 1878. Neverthless, he concluded in 1881, in 1884, and again in 1887, arrangements with Russia, providing that, if either Germany or Russia were attacked by a third Power, the other would remain neutral.

The New Kaiser William II (1888–1918). — Changes fraught with consequences for the future followed close on the accession, 15 June, 1888, of Kaiser William II. He kept the peace, it is true, for a quarter of a century; indeed, he was apparently anxious to avoid war so long as he could attain his ends without fighting for them. However, his inordinate sense of his divine mission and of the superiority of German *Kultur*, his close identification alike with the military Junker class and with the captains of Germany's prodigious industrial and commercial development, his ambitious colonial and Near Eastern policy — not merely for economic expansion but also for political domination, — his enlargement not only of the army but of the navy as well, his amazing assertions and periodic rattling of the saber, ultimately precipitated a crisis which drenched the world in blood. While there were grim and potent forces at work, too mighty perhaps for even the All-Highest to control, he had not a little to do with unchaining them. On 8 March, 1890, he dropped his experienced and wary pilot, Bis-

marck, partly because he chafed under the veteran Chancellor's dictatorial methods and partly because he differed from him on many questions of State policy. For one thing, the Kaiser declined to renew the re-insurance treaty with Russia; then he began to take more energetic steps to secure for Germany a place "in the sun," by reaching out for colonies in the few available regions of the earth where the other Powers, notably Great Britain and France, had not secured a foothold, and he began to assume the position which British official diplomacy — following only slowly in the wake of enlightened British public opinion — was beginning to discard, the position of official protector of the unsavory Turk. The final chapters of the Near Eastern crisis can best be considered later; but neither here nor in the matter of colonial expansion, did Germany come into serious conflict with Great Britain for years to come. Already, before the accession of William II, in spite of the reluctance of Bismarck and the old Kaiser to embark on a colonial career, Germany had acquired, between 1884 and 1886, German Southwest Africa as well as possessions in the Cameroons, Togoland and along the East African coast, besides various islands in the Pacific. In 1897 she made use of the murder of two missionaries to obtain the Chinese port of Kiau-Chau, in the same year she got the Caroline Islands, and, in 1899, two of the Samoa group. Few of her acquisitions were suitable for white settlers, and indeed her main aim seems to have been to secure sources for raw material, coaling stations and strategic positions. Only recently has it been made clear that in Africa she was aiming to drill native armies, to establish military and naval bases, and to control a belt straight across the Continent that would cut the British colonies in the south from their possessions in the north. There are some evidences that the British have hampered her development. For example, having possessed themselves of Walfisch Bay, the best harbor on the southwest coast, they refused to sell it; but the refusal was due to the protests of Cape Colony. Then, as a counterpoise to the German occupation of East Africa, they extended their power and territory in a manner described in another connection.[1] On the other hand, Great Britain agreed, in 1898, that Germany might buy the Portuguese colonies in Africa whenever Portugal was willing to sell; though later, Sir Edward Grey refused to sign the treaty, because Germany insisted on keeping the agreement secret.

Franco-Russian and Anglo-French Agreements. — The publication of the terms of the Triple Alliance, in 1888, and the Kaiser's refusal to renew the re-insurance treaty with the Tsar, in 1890, resulted in bring-

[1] See above, p. 774.

ing Russia and France together. Their isolation was fully revealed to them, while a young ruler, prone to fiery and reckless assertion, had seized the reins of power from the cautious if cynical old Chancellor. So, under pressure of necessity, autocratic Russia and democratic France entered into what might seem otherwise an unnatural conjunction. The first formal diplomatic step was taken in 1891, and the agreement — apparently defensive in character — was officially proclaimed, though not in detail, in 1896. Thus an effort had been made to restore the balance of power in Europe; but for a time little more was done. The Kaiser, in spite of occasional wild and threatening speeches — for example, he had declared in 1890: "everyone who is against me I shall crush" — had striven to keep his country at peace. To be sure, he had, on the repulse of the Jameson raid, sent a congratulatory telegram to Kruger; but the idea originated with his Foreign Office rather than with himself, designed, unsuccessfully as it proved, to test French feeling on the question of recognizing the independence of the Boers. Moreover, he was unable to avert rapprochements on the part of Great Britain with France and Russia, which came in the course of a few years. The European feeling manifested against her at the time of the Boer War had awakened Great Britain to a realization of her isolated position and stirred her to the task of settling her outstanding disputes with various countries, of restoring the balance of power and of extending the policy of international arbitration.

Under the Marquis of Lansdowne, who had succeeded Salisbury as Foreign Secretary[1] in 1900, the ties with Italy and Portugal had been strengthened and cordiality with France had been reëstablished after the partial estrangement dating from the British occupation of Egypt and manifest during the Boer War. In this work the British Foreign Minister was greatly assisted by the pacific Edward VII, who as Prince of Wales had formed many warm personal attachments in France, though, in his new capacity as King, he was careful not to usurp the functions of his responsible Ministers. In 1903, during his first Continental tour since his accession, he stopped at Paris, and his visit was returned by President Loubet in July. This prepared the way for the *Entente Cordiale* concluded by Lansdowne and the French Foreign Minister Delcassé, 8 April, 1904. The British agreed to recognize French interests in Morocco, while the French agreed to recognize those of Great Britain in Egypt. In return for an assurance that the British Government would not alter the political status of

[1] Salisbury had held this office himself, together with the Premiership, from 1895 to 1900.

Egypt, they ceased to ask for a fixed time for the withdrawal of the British, and consented to allow them a freer hand in the administration of Egypt's surplus revenues.

The Russo-Japanese War (1904–1906). — Events in the Far East led to a startling demonstration on the part of Germany, in 1905, and precipitated an understanding between Russia and Great Britain, whose conflicting Eastern interests had kept them at swords' points for so many generations. After Germany had secured a forcible "lease" of Kiau-Chau, Russia fixed her clutches on Port Arthur; France also obtained a port, while, in May, 1898, Great Britain, as a means of counteracting these acquisitions, got a lease of the island of Wei-Hai-Wei, together with some territory on the mainland opposite Hong-Kong. Two years later, in 1900, there occurred a rising of the Boxers, a society organized against foreign encroachment. During the course of its suppression by a joint army of the Western Powers and the United States, Russia took occasion to occupy the whole of Manchuria. Her refusal to evacuate Manchuria, or to give assurances as to the territorial integrity of Korea and the Chinese Empire, involved her in a war (1904–1905) with Japan in which the latter won a complete triumph.

The Morocco Crisis (1905), and the Algeciras Conference (1906). — While Japan leaped into the position of a military and naval power of the first rank, Russia was so prostrated that Germany took advantage of the situation to protest against the recent strengthening of the Anglo-French *Entente* by which France was given a free hand in inducing the Sultan of Morocco to undertake civilizing reforms. Although Germany, in return for commercial privileges, had agreed to the French policy of "peaceful penetration" in Morocco, she changed her tone as the war went steadily against Russia. In the spring of 1905 the Emperor visited Tangier in his yacht, and, under the pretense of protecting German commercial rights, practically assumed a protectorate over Morocco, by declaring that he could not allow any Power to step between him and the free Sovereign of a free country. The British Government remained neutral, but intimated that unprovoked aggression against France would arouse public opinion in England. Finally, a conference was arranged, which met at Algeciras, close by Gibraltar, 16 January, 1906. Although it declared the sovereignty and independence of the Sultan of Morocco, and "economic liberty without any inequality," within his dominions, and although plans for reforming the system of taxation and policy of the country were placed under international control, the paramount interests of France and Spain were recognized by intrusting them

with these financial and police duties as agents. The Kaiser, who had asserted six years previously, that "without Germany and the German Emperor no important step in international policy should be taken" had, with no small degree of success, asserted his prestige. At the same time, Great Britain had indicated that the *Entente* might be a force to be reckoned with. Moreover, the Kaiser's assertiveness, coupled with his designs in Turkey and Asia Minor, presently to be considered, prompted Russia and Great Britain to compose their differences in Persia, Afghanistan, and Tibet in 1907. Although the extent of the agreement is not fully known, there was now a *Triple Entente* of Great Britain, France, and Russia which might be employed as a weapon of defense against any aggression on the part of the Triple Alliance. Great Britain was no longer isolated, and her relations to Germany since the turn of the century must next be examined.

England and Germany. — Although the Kaiser professed friendliness to England and seemed to like English ways, Edward, *Le Roi Pacificateur*, who drew Great Britain closer to other European countries, was able to accomplish very little toward improving relations with Germany. The latter country, in consequence of the enormous development of population and industry in recent times, was seeking to spread beyond the seas, and resented the fact that Great Britain had preëmpted the best part of the colonial field. The British, on their part, were apprehensive of the increasing manufacturing and commercial development of Germany and of her growing sea power.[1] So, while Edward and his nephew the Emperor William interchanged formal visits on occasion, their relations were far from wholly cordial. Indeed, notwithstanding frequent attempts at adjustment, relations grew steadily worse. Since Germany now was the leading military power of Europe it was a matter for specially grave concern to the British that she should aspire to become a formidable sea power as well. A reasonable increase of her fleet to protect her growing commerce, and such colonies as she had acquired, was perhaps to be expected, but Britain, who freely admitted all countries to her colonial trade and who was absolutely dependent on her overseas dominions for food supplies, for raw materials and markets, could not contemplate without alarm the scale on which Germany planned her naval increase. It was clear that she meant to expand. Many years ago she began to

[1] Moreover, there were personal reasons why the English Royal and the German Imperial families were not warmly attached to one another. The Queen was a Danish princess and the Prussian attitude in the Schleswig-Holstein question had aroused a rancor never completely healed. Another source of friction was the unpopularity in Germany of Edward's sister Victoria, the mother of William II.

discourage the migration of her people to other lands, realizing that within a generation or two they would be a complete loss to the Fatherland, though the so-called Delbrück Law of 1913 was an insidious attempt to enable Germans, naturalized in other countries, to retain their allegiance to Germany as well. Since the Government did not want to restrict the birthrate either, there was a prospect of ultimate overpopulation, though there was far less immediate danger from this than there was from the fact that the country was producing more than her own people could absorb. The French and the United States had hampering protective tariffs, the British Self-governing Colonies favored the Mother Country with preferential duties, and, though all signs pointed to the contrary, Germany seems to have feared that the whole British Empire might in time be closed to her by a solid wall of protection. Hence her feverish haste to secure strategic positions in the backward countries of the world, her intrigues in India, her designs for a Middle-Africa, and also a Middle-Europe and a Middle-Asia, which latter would enable her to cut Britain and France off from their Russian ally and at the same time sever the British from their Eastern Empire. Such an unobstructed path from Berlin to the head of the Persian Gulf would mean not only economic power but political prestige as well. This, too, Germany craved. As the years went on, it became increasingly manifest that Germany's success had gone to her head, that she looked down from lofty heights of self-righteous scorn on the British as worn-out, flabby hypocrites, and on the French as hopelessly decadent. Her vainglorious Kaiser, regarding himself as a divine instrument, was convinced that by "keeping his powder dry," by appearing from time to time in "shining armor," he could obtain the objects on which he had set his heart. In this he was backed by a military caste even more militant than himself, by persistently aspiring business groups, and by vocal professors shrieking that it was the mission of *Deutschtum* to spread *Kultur* the world over. The patient application and ingenuity of the Germans and their real faith in their ideals demand praise, but many of the ambitions which they nourished, together with the means by which they sought to realize them, were bound to disturb the peace of the world. Some of the points thus briefly touched on deserve to be considered a bit more in detail.

Anglo-German Trade Rivalry. — A study of statistics in trade and production since 1870 would seem, at first sight, to indicate that Germany was outstripping Great Britain by leaps and bounds, and some have argued that this aroused a hostility which contributed materially to precipitate a crisis. Aside from the fact that the British trading

classes were the least warlike element in the country previous to the outbreak of hostilities, a few other facts must be taken into account. Since Great Britain became the workshop of the world, a generation or two before Germany began her commercial and industrial development, it is clear that, starting with a much smaller volume of business, the latter's increase or gain is relative rather than absolute. Nevertheless, it seemed when Germany's exports during the forty years from 1870 to 1910 increased by 194 per cent and her imports by 170 per cent, while those of the British could only show gains of 115 per cent and 130 per cent respectively, that the younger competitor was destined, in the long run, hopelessly to outstrip her older rival. The growth of German coal and iron production — facilitated in no small degree by the acquisition of the rich ore districts that she wrenched from France in 1870 — was equally remarkable, so that, by 1911, she was the third coal-producing country in the world, with an output exceeded only by that of the United States and Great Britain, while she produced 15,200,000 tons of iron to Great Britain's 9,500,000 tons and was excelled only by the United States in this industry. Moreover, she had become a formidable competitor in shipping, two of her lines — the North German Lloyd and the Hamburg-American — being especially famous for the size, speed, and convenience of their ships.

In many respects the Germans are entitled to the greatest credit for their achievements in building up their trade and industry. They have worked with patience and intelligence. They have evolved with great pains a system of technical education at once scientific and practical. They have trained salesmen[1] who have learned the language and studied the temper and wants, if not always the needs of prospective foreign customers; they have provided cheap goods of a reasonably serviceable grade for improvident folk, and have arranged long and easy terms of payment. The British, trusting in the durable high grade character of their goods and in their security against competition, long remained, to a not inconsiderable extent, complacently indifferent to the desires of their customers; they clung to antiquated methods and machinery, and took their ease, cutting into business hours with afternoon tea, hunting, and athletic sports. On the other hand, certain of the German business methods have been short-sighted and unscrupulous. By means of Government subsidies and tariffs they had encouraged, sometimes overstimulated home production and kept the price high in their own country in order to dump the surplus at cheap rates on markets which they wished to penetrate; by secret

[1] Their mercantile class have been a striking contrast to their cruel and overbearing bureaucratic officials.

underhanded methods they have got control of banks, business concerns, and newspapers in foreign countries, and by undue extension of credit had brought their finances — in the opinion of many — to a perilous state just previous to the war.

Once roused to the danger of German competition and having recovered from the depressing effects of the Boer War which for a time hampered their efforts, the British began to recover their lost ground. An examination of the figures from 1909 to 1913 will show that Great Britain's exports increased by 38.6 per cent — including re-exports by 46 per cent — as against Germany's 44.3 per cent, while the gains in imports were 23 and 20.5 per cent respectively. If the basis of increase per head were considered, the British gain would be even more striking, since the population of Germany is greater, and for years has increased more rapidly than that of the United Kingdom. In 1913 British foreign trade was the greatest in her history.[1] She still possessed 50 per cent of the world's tonnage and was building annually more shipping than the rest of the world together. Her prosperity[2] was marked,[3] and there was, in spite of much industrial discontent, comparatively little unemployment, while, owing to various causes, Germany had fallen into a period of industrial and commercial depression with little prospect of improvement.

All together, while for years there had been complaints and warnings in consular reports, in periodicals and newspapers, while there had been panics from time to time, constant misery among the unskilled, together with complaints from the skilled artisans that wages did not keep pace with rising prices, while there was steady agitation for a protective tariff and while apprehension and bitterness were manifest toward Germany in many quarters, it is out of the question to assert

[1] There is another aspect of the statistics which seems, from a superficial glance, to be rather damaging to Great Britain, namely, that for many years her imports have exceeded her exports; but her position is like that of the rich investor living on his income; the excess represents a surplus bought with the return from foreign investments and the yield from her enormous carrying trade. In 1912 Great Britain had invested abroad some £4,000,000,000, fully four times as much as Germany.

[2] It apparently had begun to spend itself by the spring of 1914, though the decline had not become very marked when the war broke out.

[3] Some would ask, if Germany with complete freedom of trade in the British dominions was underselling her competitor, how has it been possible that the latter has of late been holding her own? The answer is that in the Self-governing Colonies there are preferential tariffs in favor of Great Britain while in the colonies under the control of the British Parliament there is no discrimination. It is in the former that Great Britain has counterbalanced Germany's gains in the latter, as well as in various other undeveloped parts of the world.

that British jealousy of German trade ascendancy led to the War. The traditional British free trade policy was triumphantly vindicated at the polls in 1906 and twice in 1910; the Liberal Administration, in power for eight years previous to the War, sought in every way to preserve the peace; the commercial classes were those most opposed to war; and finally, by responding to the stimulus of competition, Great Britain had, for at least three years previous to the crisis, begun to recover her old lead over her threatening trade rival.

The Race in Naval Armaments. — Meantime, the creation of a powerful navy, to supplement her army — the most formidable in Europe — had aroused the gravest disquiet, among the far-seeing, as to Germany's designs. Very early in his reign, Kaiser Wilhelm began to manifest an intense enthusiasm for a big navy, to protect, as he said, Germany's expanding commerce; but various of his characteristically thumping expressions, such as "the trident must be in our hands," gave color to the suspicion that his ultimate aim was to contest the naval supremacy of Great Britain. However, the actual work of building up the German Navy during the past twenty years has been due mainly to the tireless energy of Admiral von Tirpitz, who became Minister of Marine in 1897. The very next year, the German Navy League was founded to popularize the idea of a great fleet, and a million members were soon enrolled. Also, in 1898, the new Minister introduced his first bill to provide for a high seas fleet. Two years later, in 1900, when Great Britain was in the grip of the Boer War without a friend in Europe, a second bill was introduced providing for increased estimates. The British were forced to accept the challenge: thus a race of armaments, feverishly intermittent, began. Von Tirpitz, in season and out of season, worked through the press, the Navy League, as well as in the Reichstag, to realize his cherished ambition. In this same year, 1900, a former chief of the Admiralty staff frankly considered the possibility of a war against England, which, he declared, was not improbable "owing to the animosity which exists in our country toward England, and, on the other side, to the sentiments of the British nation toward all Continental Powers and in particular against Germany."

The British fleet was put on its modern basis by the Naval Defense Act of 1889. Aside from needed increase and reorganization, the two-Power standard was then adopted; that is, the naval strength of Great Britain should be equal to that of any two other nations combined, France and Russia being at that time the two greatest rivals to the British at sea. Then came the German menace involved in the Naval Law of 1898. This same year the Tsar of Russia "proposed an Inter-

national Conference for the purpose of devising means for reducing expenditure on naval and military armaments." Although the Hague Conference of 1899 was unable to agree upon a plan of reduction of armaments, it recommended the proposal for consideration by the various Governments concerned. The German reply was the law of 1900 almost doubling her navy. Owing to the agreements of 1902 with Japan and of 1904 with France, Great Britain was able to withdraw the greater portion of her fleet from stations in Chinese and Japanese waters and from the Mediterranean, and to concentrate in the English Channel. About the same time, old ships began to be scrapped, and a new type, the so-called Dreadnought, was introduced, — speedy, heavily armored and equipped with a small number of large caliber guns instead of many guns of various calibers. These two facts gave von Tirpitz, who had refused to consider any project for reduction of armaments, a new excuse to expand his construction program, for which the Morocco crisis of 1905 had furnished another stimulus. Although he carried a third Naval Bill in 1906, the radical Liberals in England succeeded in reducing substantially the estimates for 1906. Unhappily, this overture was regarded by the Kaiser as a confession of weakness. He declared flatly that, if the question of regulation of armaments were brought before the second Hague Conference, called to meet in 1907, he should decline to be represented. Indeed, he went further, on another occasion, and declared that he regarded the approaching Conference as "great nonsense."[1]

A fourth German Naval bill, in 1908, prompted Edward VII to declare, during the course of a visit to his Imperial cousin, that "the naval rivalry set on foot by Germany was sure to provoke suspicions as to its ultimate intentions, and thus to embitter relations, then perfectly friendly and natural, between the two countries." While King Edward was optimistic about the existing feeling, there was no doubt that the German big-navy party were making matters worse. The Kaiser, in an interview published in a London newspaper, admitted that "a majority of his people were hostile to England." Among the British there was a large pacific element, though, on the other hand, there were stalwart spirits who insisted on more battleships. At the same time, Lord Roberts, England's greatest general, sought to rouse his countrymen from a fancied sense of security by pleading for compulsory military training. Few took him seriously, but the naval estimates were once more greatly increased, owing in no small degree

[1] The German Government was not only opposed to disarmament but even to arbitration treaties, on the ground that arbitration was a derogation of sovereignty and that it handicapped, in case of difficulties arising, a people prepared to strike.

to the fact that Austria backed by Germany had just annexed the provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina. This time the Reichstag — seeing signs of determination rather than yielding, and, for the moment at least, impressed by the hopelessness of gaining in the race — refused new taxes to meet another increase in the German building program. Thereupon, von Bethmann-Hollweg, who became Chancellor in this year, 1909, made a specious overture, proposing that Germany would "retard her rate," if the British would promise to remain neutral in the event of a Continental war. The British naturally hesitated to accept such a proposal in view of the fact that it might involve deserting her allies, and, while they were still negotiating, the Kaiser and the Chancellor[1] frankly stated that they could not bind themselves not to enlarge their naval program. Following a second crisis in Morocco in 1911, when the attitude of British statesmen forced Germany to abate her demands, the Reichstag at length passed a fifth bill which made it clearer than ever that Germany was aiming "to be supremely powerful both by sea and land." Two days after the new program was announced, Lord Haldane, a British statesman of decided German sympathies, arrived in Berlin to discuss the naval situation, but the result proved futile. From this time, however, the British Government ceased to maintain a two-Power standard, and it was definitely stated in Parliament that she would retard her building whenever Germany did the like. When Admiral Tirpitz, in February, 1913, agreed that the British ratio of 16 to 10 — which she had adopted in relation to Germany in place of the old two-Power standard — was "acceptable" to him, Mr. Churchill, the British First Lord of the Admiralty, proposed a "naval holiday"; but Tirpitz refused this, on the ground that Germany could not afford to have her plants and her shipyards idle. Mr. Churchill's renewal of the offer, 18 October, was not favorably received by the public of either country. Even the friendly Lord Haldane went so far as to say that: "Whatever efforts Germany may make she must reckon upon our making efforts which will be still greater, because sea power is our life and in sea power we intend to remain supreme." Apparently, Germany finally had come to recognize this fact, and, though there was no retardation, there had come to be "a substantial agreement" as to the respective rates of increase.

It seems difficult not to place on Germany the chief blame for this costly procedure; for Great Britain had never menaced German commerce; indeed, she had been guilty of little or no aggression for a hun-

[1] The latter declared, 30 March, 1911, that he considered "any control of armaments as absolutely impracticable."

dred years. In time of peace, Germany could enjoy perfect freedom of the seas; she might fear British control of the Suez and of coaling stations, but there was no indication that these would be used against her unless she provoked hostile action. While there were Englishmen who indulged in reckless utterances, the statesmen in power, backed by the majority who kept them there, strove for peace at every crisis, notably, as we shall see, in 1908, 1911, and 1914. They refused to increase their land army in spite of the fervid agitation of Lord Roberts. They made no protest against the great military force which Germany regarded as essential for the protection of her frontiers, but insisted that the British supremacy at sea must be maintained for the purpose of guarding the lanes of travel to her Colonies so vitally essential not only for raw materials and markets but for food supply itself. While some Germans recognized this point of view, the general attitude was arrogant and ominous. The trident-grasping Kaiser had declared: "our future lies on the water"; one of his ex-Chancellors wrote a book in which he asserted that "England's reluctance to make war on us has allowed us to get a grip on the sea," and these are only two out of any number of similar statements that might be quoted. A large section of the press was hostile in tone, the possibility of invading England was openly discussed, and German officers gleefully drank to *Der Tag*, or the day when they would meet England in a decisive naval combat.

German Kultur. — During the fifty, and still more during the twenty-five years preceding the War, the German people have undergone an amazing and startling transformation. The old land of the dreamy philosopher, the gifted composer, the patient scholar, the docile toiler, has, since the founding of the Empire, been forced under the spell of Prussia and its grim and ruthless materialism. Frederick the Great, who first brought his State into the circle of first-rate Powers, is the ancestor of the arbitrary and cynical tradition which came to prevail. He would have "no ministers abroad but spies, no ministers at home but clerks," and declared: "I keep my treaties just so long as it is my interest to keep them and no longer." The depths to which the Germans were reduced by Napoleon's victorious troops, their partial recovery with their conscript army, the failure of the liberal revolution of 1848 and the triumph of Bismarck, and the unexampled prosperity which followed under Prussian domination, irresistibly converted the country to a policy of hard realism.

Meantime, the German thinkers had become deeply impressed by the Darwinian doctrine of the survival of the fittest. They taught themselves to believe that they were superior beings, and that it was

their mission to impose their Kultur — their peculiar philosophy of life and their peculiar form of political, social, and industrial organization — on the rest of the world even by military force. Many, indeed, came to glorify war as the noblest form of human activity, insisting that — as an essential condition to progress — the weak should be crushed and the strong prevail. Perhaps the most influential pioneer of this school was Heinrich von Treitschke (1834–1896), who devoted his rare eloquence and literary skill to the exaltation of the German State under Prussian domination. "The greatness and goodness of the world," he passionately taught, "is to be found in the predominance there of German culture, of the German mind, in a word, of the German character." A German World Empire was his ambition, and war was the way to bring it about. "War," he avowed, "is both justifiable and moral, and . . . the ideal of perpetual peace is not only impossible, but immoral as well." After 1870 his fury was concentrated against England as the final great obstacle in Germany's progress toward her goal. "If our Empire," he declared, "has the courage to follow an independent colonial policy, a collision of our interests and those of England is unavoidable. It was natural and logical that the new Great Power of Central Europe had to settle affairs with all Great Powers. We have settled our accounts with Austro-Hungary, with France, and with Russia. The last settlement, the settlement with England, will be the lengthiest and the most difficult." In 1911 this necessity of a war with England, in order that Germany might secure her "place in the sun," was discussed with brazen frankness by von Bernhardi in *Germany and the Next War*.

Perhaps enough has been said of the Kaiser — who regarded himself as the anointed of God to carry on the work of his ancestors and to lead the German people to greater glory and power and wealth. For years he had sought to attain these ends by alternating gracious persuasion with bluster. Many of his expressions — his "mailed fist," his "shining armor," and his injunction to the Chinese Expeditionary force, in 1900, to "be as terrible as Attila's Huns" — are known everywhere. Not infrequently he rose to supreme heights. To his recruits at Potsdam, in 1911, he announced: "Body and soul you belong to me. If I command you to shoot your fathers and mothers . . . you must follow my command without a murmur." But it was in his speech to his soldiers on the Declaration of War in 1914 that he reached the apogee of presumption: "Remember," he said, "that the German people are the chosen of God. On me as German Emperor the spirit of God has descended. I am His weapon, His sword and His Vice-regent. Woe to the disobedient! Death to cowards and un-

believers!" It was mentality such as this which confronted Great Britain, as well as the rest of the world.

The Pan-German Movement. — There was much that was fine in the German's devotion to his State and his fervid faith in his Kultur, and much that was said and written might have seemed the mere vaporings of a ruler afflicted with acute Imperial megalomania and of deluded egotistical professors, but it was backed not only by the domineering cult of the Prussian caste but by a consuming zeal for political prestige and business domination. The Pan-German League, founded in 1886, at first counted for little, but after its reorganization in 1893, it became a potent factor in propaganda for German expansion. It aimed to reach out and bring within the Empire Holland, Flemish Belgium, and even — according to the plans of the more ambitious — the Scandinavian countries, together with Austria and the German parts of Russia. Another design was to press down through the Balkans and to control a road to the head of the Persian Gulf, and still another was to establish a Middle-Africa as well. In the course of time the Pan-Germans joined forces with the Navy League and other influential organizations. While the annexation policy remained largely a dream before the War, it came very near a grim reality during the course of the struggle, though Holland and the Scandinavian countries never came within Germany's grip.

Futile Negotiations. — In spite of commercial rivalry, race of armaments and ambitions openly proclaimed, the German Government made more than one overture to Great Britain. But they all involved the possibility of deserting France and Russia with whom the British were united in a defensive agreement. For example, von Bethmann-Hollweg's proposal for a retardation in construction was coupled with the condition that the British and the Germans should agree that (1) Neither country had any idea of aggression and that neither would in fact attack the other; (2) That, in the event of an attack made on either Power by a third Power or group of Powers, the Power not attacked should stand aside. Gladly Great Britain would have accepted the first point; but the second she could not allow herself to be trapped into accepting. Bismarck had shown, in 1870, how easily Germany could draw an attack on herself when she desired war. In such an event, Great Britain once entangled in this agreement — and she had a prejudice for observing treaty obligations which the new German political philosophy had discarded — would have to hold hopelessly aloof while France, or even Belgium, whose neutrality she had joined in guaranteeing, were crushed. Sir Edward Grey admirably stated the British position in 1911: "One does not,"

he said, "make new friendships worth having by deserting old ones. New friendships by all means let us make but not at the expense of the ones we have." At the time of Lord Haldane's visit, in 1912, when negotiations were reopened, Great Britain expressed her readiness to agree that she would "neither make, nor join in, any unprovoked attack upon Germany" and to give an assurance that "aggression upon Germany is not the subject, and forms no part of any treaty, understanding or combination to which England is now a party, nor will she become a party to anything that has such an object." This, however, would not satisfy Germany, who would come to no terms unless England would "acquiesce in a formula of neutrality which was deliberately calculated to destroy her existing friendships with France and Russia, and by which she would have abandoned her treaty obligations to small states." Meantime, a long chain of events in the Near East led straight to an appalling crisis which, while the British Foreign Office strove to maintain the peace of Europe, vindicated their foresight in rejecting the specious proposals above outlined.

German Penetration in the Near East. — In 1889 the Kaiser paid a visit to the Sultan at Constantinople which proved the prelude to a German penetration of European and Asiatic Turkey, not for the purposes of colonization, but for commercial expansion and political prestige. German officers were sent to train Turkish troops, German capital was placed in the country, banks were established and German merchants began to acquire the lion's share of Turkish trade. These activities began after Great Britain, even before her entente with Russia, had come to realize that there were better ways of holding in check her ancient Muscovite rival than by continuing to bolster up the hopelessly corrupt Turkish State.

Great Britain and Turkey (1894–1897). — Terrible massacres — during the years 1894–1896 — of the Armenians, whose Christian national aspirations infuriated the Sultan, precipitated the change in the British attitude. Early in 1895, the Powers presented a joint note to the Porte demanding reforms; but, this time, obstruction came from Russia — who had no desire to see a strong Armenian state protected by the Powers blocking her road to the Persian Gulf. Gladstone, from the retirement in which he was spending his declining years, raised his voice for independent intervention on the part of Great Britain; while his appeal was not acted on, and while the Armenians had to wait till 1899 before any reforms were undertaken, he converted many to his way of thinking. Meantime, in a speech of 19 January, 1897, Salisbury, who had gradually come to the conclusion that his country had erred in seeking to maintain the integ-

rity of Turkey, uttered his famous declaration: "We put all our money on the wrong horse." In view of events at this time and of the atrocious massacres sanctioned by Germany during the Great War, it would seem that Germany thus early was, to no small degree, responsible for encouraging the Turk in defying the will of the Powers. Indeed, in 1896, while the Sultan's hands were red with blood, the Kaiser thought it a fitting time to send him an Imperial photograph. This he followed up, in 1898, by a tour through the Turkish dominions, during which at Damascus he made an amazing speech wherein he declared that the 300,000,000 Mohammedans who looked to the Sultan as Caliph would find in him, the Kaiser, a friend and protector.

The Bagdad Railway Project. — Only an incurable optimist could hope, in view of past experience, to regenerate the Turkish régime. However, the Kaiser and his advisers may have thought that they could succeed where others had failed; moreover, here was a chance for legitimate development in almost the only area not preëmpted by Great Britain, France or Russia. Mesopotamia, the valley of the Tigris and the Euphrates, might be restored to its ancient fertility, and a commercial route might be opened through Asia Minor to the head of the Persian Gulf. Germany and Austria were closely allied, Germany was rapidly securing control of Turkey; if the Austro-German alliance could dominate the Balkans there would be created an uninterrupted highway from Berlin to the Indian Ocean. The menacing feature of this scheme was that it would drive a solid wedge between the British and the French on the west and Russia on the east, threatening the British line of communication between Egypt and India, and even jeopardizing the security of the British occupation of Egypt. More than one German writer expressed the German ambitions in the frankest of language. "Egypt is a prize which for Turkey would well be worth the risk of taking sides with Germany in a war with England," said one, while another wrote: "The Bagdad railroad being a blow at the interests of British Imperialism, Turkey could intrust its construction only to the German company, because she knew that Germany's army and navy stood behind her." The preliminary concession was secured, in 1899, the year after the Kaiser's second visit to Constantinople, and, in 1903, the steps were completed by which the Bagdad Railway Company was established as an Ottoman corporation. In spite of the undoubted commercial advantage of such a railway, the British prevented the Germans from securing the terminal port of Koweit at the head of the Persian Gulf, and blocked the progress of the undertaking, until satisfactory financial and

political arrangements could be devised.[1] It is clear that it was not the project itself, but the methods by which it was to be carried out to which the British objected; since, in 1914, they agreed to a treaty for the completion of the road which was only interrupted by the outbreak of the war.

The Young Turkish Revolution (1908). — Germany's hold on the Ottoman Government was for the moment loosened by the Young Turkish Revolution in 1908, a movement which not only failed to realize the hopeful expectations which it had aroused, but started a train of events which contributed to a world tragedy. Unfortunately, the leaders were actuated by Mohammedan bigotry and intense nationalism as much as by democratic and reforming zeal. Hence they stirred up opposition among the subject peoples in the Ottoman Empire and, even worse, they inspired fear among European Powers that, with their fresh vigor, they might seek to recover territories on which the old effete Government had practically relaxed its hold. This prompted Francis Joseph, the Austrian Emperor, to announce, 3 October, 1908, the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, which Austria had administered since 1878. Russia opposed this extension of Austrian power in the Balkans, but she was not in a position to fight, for she had not recovered from her defeat by Japan in 1904–1905, and Great Britain was unwilling to support her in a Balkan quarrel, the ultimate consequences of which the British had not yet come to realize. The Kaiser made much of the fact that he had appeared behind his Austrian ally in "shining armor." Moreover, Germany, though for years she had been cultivating the old régime, soon managed to secure an equally strong hold over the leaders of the Young Turks. While engaged in this task she essayed another trial of power in Morocco.

The Second Morocco Crisis (1911). — Twice by trading on the weakness of Russia the Kaiser had successfully asserted himself: in Morocco in 1905 and in the Balkans in 1908. His third effort was far less successful. In consequence of a rebellion in Morocco, France detailed troops to restore order; whereupon Germany took occasion to declare that she would not acquiesce in French ascendancy in the country without compensation, and, 2 July, 1911, the Kaiser sent a ship of

[1] The Germans, who undertook the construction in sections, were to be liberally paid by an increase in the Turkish customs in which the British were heavily interested. That was the first proposal; the second was that Germany, France, and England should each advance 30 per cent of the required funds and Russia 10 per cent; but according to the concession of 1903, Germany could appoint six of the eleven directors of the railway company, and would thus control its policy, while the three other Powers concerned advanced 70 per cent of the funds.

war to Agadir. His attempt to test the strength of the Anglo-French Entente was speedily and conclusively met. The British Government declared that Germany's action created a new and grave situation, and that it did not purpose to stand aside if British interests and treaty relations with France were affected. While Germany was not without justification in assuming that one element in France was seizing the occasion of the disturbed condition of Morocco to intrench herself there by force, she hurt her case by her attempt to bully France and to ignore England. Brought to a standstill by the latter's determined attitude, she now condescended to indicate the terms on which she was prepared to treat with France. England agreed not to interfere, and, by an arrangement, concluded in November, Germany, in return for territorial cessions in the Congo region and a guarantee of equal economic opportunities for all Powers in Morocco, agreed to the French political ascendancy in the latter country. The Pan-Germanists were infuriated by what they regarded as a humiliating setback to German diplomatic prestige.

The First Balkan War (1912–1913). — Not long after, the Christian States of the Balkans seized the opportunity of a war between Italy and Turkey (1911–1912) to combine against the latter for the purpose of realizing long-cherished ambitions and redressing ancient grievances. Zeal for reform and national aspiration were, it should be said, fomented by Russia, the champion of Pan-Slavism, who longed to expel German-ridden Turkey from Europe, and to control Constantinople and the exit from the Black Sea. By the end of July, 1912, alliances were concluded between Greece, Bulgaria, Serbia, and Montenegro. The swift decisive campaign which followed the opening of war in October, gave the slow-moving European Powers no chance to get their bearings. Not only was the defeat of Turkey a sore blow to the military prestige of the Germans who had trained the Turkish army, but the prospect of a strong united Balkan League promised a serious obstruction to the Austro-German plan of dominating the Balkans.

The Treaty of London (1913). — After the Balkan Allies had gained a series of striking successes, a peace conference was arranged at London, where delegates from the countries at war held their first meeting 16 December, 1912. Meantime, Great Britain and the other Great Powers had been working to keep the conflict localized, and the British Premier, Mr. Asquith, in a speech of 9 November, had declared that: "the victors were not to be robbed of the fruits which had cost them so dear." Terms which the Turkish delegation agreed to accept were rejected in Constantinople in consequence of a *coup d'état*, and hostilities, which had been suspended, were reopened. On 16 May, 1913, the

peace sittings were resumed; after ten days of wrangling, Sir Edward Grey, the British Foreign Minister, sent for three of the delegates and informed them that they must agree to terms on the basis of a treaty drawn up by the Great Powers, or leave London. As a result, the Treaty of London was signed, 30 May, 1913, by which Turkey ceded to the Balkan allies all European territories north and west of a line from Midea, on the Black Sea, to Enos, on the Ægean, together with the Island of Crete. Settlement of the status and frontiers of Albania was left to the determination of the Great Powers.

The Second Balkan War and the Treaty of Bucharest (1913). — Trouble began when Austria, supported by Italy, insisted that Albania be set up as an autonomous State. This blow to Serbia was rendered all the harder by withholding from her the port of Durazzo, which cut off this landlocked country from reaching the Adriatic. Blocked toward the west, Serbia, in view of the great gains which her armies had made in Macedonia, asked Bulgaria for a revision of the treaty which they had made in February, 1912, regarding the future disposal of Macedonia — a demand in which she was backed by Greece. Bulgaria — egged on by Austria — without referring the dispute to the arbitration of the Tsar of Russia[1] whom she doubtless feared would decide against her, indeed without warning or declaration of war, on 29 June attacked the Greek-Serbian lines in Macedonia. Rumania, who had stood aloof in the previous war, now came in with a fresh army in the Bulgarian rear. For a few weeks the latter country waged a hopeless struggle with her exhausted troops, but, finally, she was forced to agree to the Treaty of Bucharest, 6 August, 1913, by which all her opponents profited at her expense. Though the conflict had been precipitated by her own folly, Bulgaria had emerged from the second Balkan War sadly disappointed and furiously embittered against her former Balkan allies. Serbia, while she had acquired some Macedonian territory, had failed to secure her exit to the sea and nourished a new grievance against Austria. Thus the Balkan problem was more acute than ever, and the Powers of Europe were in a state of unstable equilibrium.

The European Situation (1913–1914). — In spite of the growth of international socialism, pacifistic writing, and Hague Tribunals, expensive military establishments were being maintained, and no acceptable scheme of disarmament had been devised. The Triple Alliance had provoked the Triple Entente, and although the latter, from all indications, was as purely defensive in character as the former

[1] This was to have been the last resort, according to the Treaty of February, 1912.

professed to be, Germany insisted that she was being encircled on land and deprived of the freedom of the seas; she was an open advocate of the politics of power which she had arrogantly asserted on three occasions, in 1905, 1909, and 1911; her population, though she was still able to absorb it, was increasing, and, more pressing and serious, she was manufacturing more than she could consume; she envied France and Great Britain their colonies; she was striving to control one route through the Balkans to the Persian Gulf and another across central Africa from east to west. Since 1898 she had been building up a powerful navy, and, not content with her great and highly trained army, she passed a Bill, in 1913, greatly to increase her effective force, a step which stimulated France and Russia to further efforts and also brought Belgium to introduce universal military service. So much for Germany; but all the other countries had their fears, ambitions, and disturbing elements. France still resented the loss of Alsace and Lorraine, though there is no indication that she would have gone to war solely for that cause, but she feared for the safety of her colonies, and she had been obliged to submit to more than one affront from her former conqueror, which kept her apprehensive and galled her pride. Great Britain had, in Germany, a serious manufacturing and commercial competitor, the increase of the German navy was a menace to the sea power on which the safety of her Empire depended, to say nothing of the pretentious threats which the Germans frequently directed against her.[1] Italy was irritated at German aid to Turkey in the recent war with Tripoli, and she was burning to secure *Italia Irredenta*, districts in the Austrian Alps which menaced her safety, and stretches on the Eastern shore of the Adriatic which she desired on sentimental and commercial grounds. The real storm center, however, was in the Near East. Russia, aiming to control the outlet from the Black Sea, was resolutely championing the pan-Slavic interests against Austria, who had made a vain attempt, so early as August, 1913, to secure Italian support in an aggressive war against Serbia.

The Serajevo Tragedy. — Suddenly, 28 June, 1914, Francis Ferdinand, the Austrian heir-apparent, together with his Consort, were murdered at Serajevo in Bosnia. What followed has been told time

[1] In spite of the tenseness of the European situation, accentuated by German patriotic celebrations at the centenary of the Battle of Leipzig (October, 1913), Mr. Lloyd George pleaded in the *Daily Mail*, 2 January, 1914, for a reduction of armaments on the grounds that (1) British relations with Germany were infinitely more friendly than they had been for years; (2) Germany was concentrating on her army rather than on her navy; and (3) the spread of revolt against military oppression throughout Christendom.

and again, and should be considered here chiefly so far as Great Britain is concerned. While the assassins were Austro-Hungarian subjects they were Serbians; moreover, there seems to be little doubt that their action was due to Serbian propaganda and promoted by Serbian assistance. Here was a heaven-sent chance to break the strength of a State, which — backed by all the strength of Russia and pan-Slavism — blocked the Austro-German route to the Ægean, a necessary stage on the road to the Persian Gulf. Although a momentous conference was called by the Kaiser, 5 July, to see if his generals, his admirals, and his financiers were ready, and although heavy selling of certain foreign stocks by Berlin operators took place, 10–13 July, no official step was taken till 23 July, when Austria launched an ultimatum against Serbia, which, in the words of Sir Edward Grey, was "a more formidable document than any which he had ever seen before addressed by one State to another independent State."[1] The moment was well chosen. Great Britain was in the throes of the struggle over the Irish Home Rule Bill. France was distracted over the notorious Caillaux trial, while reports of 13, 14 July disclosed serious weakness in the equipment of the army, which only accentuated a strong Socialistic sentiment against mounting expenses for armaments. At the same time, Russia was shaken by serious labor troubles manifested in the outbreak of strikes at St. Petersburg. The President and Premier of France were absent in Russia, and the Kaiser was cruising along the Norwegian coast. Thus his assertion may be true that he never saw the actual ultimatum to Serbia, though the responsibility of the German Government is all the greater, since, as they afterwards admitted in their own *White Book*, they "permitted Austria a completely free hand in her action toward Serbia." Clearly, as the British Government asserted, it was "the deliberate intention" of Austria, and of Germany who backed her, "to take both Serbia and Europe by surprise."

The Austrian Ultimatum to Serbia. — The Austrian ultimatum, or *démarche*, as they preferred to call it, embodied ten drastic demands and was to be answered within forty-eight hours. On 24 July Germany announced to the Powers her approval of the note. The Serbian reply, presented 25 July, agreed unqualifiedly to eight of the demands. The two others she was unable to agree to unreservedly; nevertheless, with the hope of adjusting peacefully even these two disputed points, Serbia declared her willingness to submit the decision

[1] *Vorwaerts*, the Berlin Socialistic paper, stated, 25 July, that the demands on Serbia "are more brutal than have been ever put to an independent State in the world's history, and can only be intended deliberately to provoke war."

to the Hague Tribunal or to the Great Powers. Although the Serbian reply was a fairly lengthy document, the Austrian Minister to Belgrade, scarcely more than thirty minutes after he received it, was seated in a train leaving the city. All the facts and indications go to support the assertion of the British Ambassador to Vienna "that the Austro-Hungarian note was so drawn as to make war inevitable, that their Government are fully resolved to have a war with Serbia." Austria had great provocation; but her *démarche* was couched in such a form as to make it impossible for Serbia to accept all its terms without reserve if she hoped to maintain her national independence and self-respect.

Sir Edward Grey's Attempts to Arbitrate. — From the first, Sir Edward Grey strove valiantly to effect a settlement "simply and solely from the point of view of the peace of Europe." His aim was not "to localize the conflict," as the German *White Book* later asserted, but to prevent an Austrian attack on Serbia which would inevitably draw in Russia on the Serbian side, with the ghastly prospect of involving the whole of Europe in war. He had not hesitated to declare, with reference to the Serajevo tragedy, that "no crime has ever aroused deeper or more general horror throughout Europe; none has ever been less justified. Sympathy for Austria was universal. Both the Governments and the public opinion of Europe were ready to support her in any measures, however severe, which she might think it necessary to take for the punishment of the murderer and his accomplices"; moreover, 24 July, he urged Serbia "to express concern and regret" and "to give Austria the fullest satisfaction" if it was proved that Serbian officials were involved. On the 25th, the day the Austrian note was answered, he proposed and urged that Germany, France, Italy, and Great Britain arrange a conference to find some way out of the difficulty. France, Italy, and even Russia agreed, but Germany, while full of pacific assurances that she was doing her best to restrain her ally, refused to agree to this plan, on the ground that it would be forcing Austria into an arbitration which she had not sought. Naturally she had not! Germany failed to publish in the *White Book* her correspondence with Austria during these critical days; but evidence later disclosed makes it clear that she was backing Austria to the limit in the expected event that Serbia refused to agree to her impossible demands. Meantime, 28 July, Austria declared war on Serbia, and Russia, who had given Serbia promises of support, ordered a partial mobilization, 29 July; this was followed two days later, 31 July, by a general mobilization, only after Austria had bombarded the Serbian capital of Belgrade

on the 30th. Thenceforth, Germany took the initiative. When Russia and France refused to accept her peremptory ultimatums, she declared war on the former, 1 August, and on the latter, 3 August, after German armies had already invaded Luxemburg and entered French territory.

"The Question of Responsibility." — Five years previously, in 1909, Germany by appearing behind Austria "in shining armor" had overawed Russia into allowing Austria to work her will in the Balkans. This time it was not to be. The guilt of Germany in provoking the crisis is pronounced in a scathing indictment by Prince Lichnowsky, her Ambassador to London, who, because of his laudable desire to promote good relations with Great Britain, had for some time been treated with scant consideration by his own Government. Here is what he says:

"As is evident from all official publications — and this is not refuted by our *White Book*, which, owing to the poverty of its contents and to its omissions, is a gravely self-accusing document —

"1. We encouraged Count Berchtold (Austrian Foreign Minister) to attack Serbia, although German interests were not involved (*sic!*) and the danger of a world-war must have been known to us. Whether we were aware of the wording of the Ultimatum is completely immaterial.

"2. During the time between the 23d and 30th July, 1914, when M. Sazonow (Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs) emphatically declared that he would not tolerate any attack on Serbia, we rejected the British proposals of mediation, although Serbia, under Russian and British pressure, had accepted almost the whole of the Ultimatum, and although an agreement about the two points at issue could easily have been reached, and Count Berchtold was even prepared to content himself with the Serbian reply.

"3. On the 30th July (31 July), when Count Berchtold wanted to come to terms, we sent an Ultimatum to Petrograd merely because of the Russian mobilization, although Austria had not been attacked; and on the 31st July (1 August) we declared war on Russia, although the Tsar pledged his word that he would not order a man to march as long as negotiations were proceeding — thus deliberately destroying the possibility of a peaceful settlement.

"In view of the above undeniable facts, it is no wonder that the whole of the civilized world, outside Germany, places the entire responsibility for the world-war upon our shoulders."

Great Britain Drawn into the War. — Happily for Great Britain, both her duty and her interest impelled her to strive for peace to check Austro-German aggressions, and, if need be, to support France, Russia, and Belgium. She had made specific agreements with France in 1904 and with Russia in 1907, which apparently contem-

plated joint action in case of necessity, though she was free to decide what constituted a case of necessity. However, she was bound in honor to protect the French coast, since the French had withdrawn their whole fleet to the Mediterranean, leaving the British to concentrate in the Channel and North Sea. Furthermore, together with Prussia, Austria, France, and Russia, she had guaranteed the neutrality of Belgium in 1839. Austro-German domination of the Balkans might seriously menace her Eastern possessions, while German occupation of Belgium, in conjunction with her steadily increasing navy, might threaten the very existence of the British Isles. Finally, in the event of a European War, Great Britain would have to face the issue of standing by France and Russia or leaving them to be crushed, with the certain prospect of having to fight the victor alone in the near future. Nevertheless, while Sir Edward Grey strove by every means in his power to bring about a peaceable adjustment, he steadfastly refused from the first to enter into any engagement binding his country to support Russia and France by force of arms. Such an assurance might have brought Germany to reason; but it would have been quite contrary to his pacific intentions. Moreover, he was a responsible Cabinet Minister, and it is almost certain that the Liberal party in the Commons, and public opinion outside, would never have supported a pledge to enter into war on what seemed to most a purely Balkan quarrel. Yet, by 29 July, he had reached the point of solemnly warning the German Ambassador in London "that there was no question of our intervening if Germany was not involved, or even if France was not involved, but if the issue did become such as we thought British interests required us to intervene, we must intervene at once." The same day, the Imperial Chancellor at Berlin offered, in return for British neutrality, "every assurance that the Imperial Government aimed at no territorial acquisitions at the expense of France." But, when questioned by the British Ambassador, he was unable to "give a similar undertaking" with regard to the French Colonies, or to guarantee that German forces might not be forced to enter Belgium. As a result, the British Government refused to bind themselves to neutrality on such terms. Honor and prudence both demanded that Great Britain keep her hands absolutely free to act if there was any possibility of crushing France or violating Belgium.

The Violation of Belgium. — On 31 July, Sir Edward Grey sent definite inquiries both to France and Germany whether they were "prepared to engage to respect the neutrality of Belgium so long as no other Power violates it." France gave an unqualified promise at once. Officially, Germany would give no such assurances, though

the well-disposed Lichnowsky sought to ascertain the intentions of the British Government in case guarantees were given regarding Belgium and the integrity of France and her colonies. On 2 August, Germany invaded Luxemburg and, that same day, sent an ultimatum to Belgium demanding "a free passage through Belgian territory, and promising to maintain the independence and integrity of the kingdom and its possessions at the conclusion of peace, threatening, in case of refusal to treat Belgium as an enemy. An answer was requested within twelve hours." This outrageous proceeding caused the King of the Belgians to appeal to the King of Great Britain for "diplomatic intervention to safeguard the integrity of Belgium." In response to King Albert's appeal, the British Government sent, 4 August, an ultimatum through their Ambassador at Berlin requesting that the German Government give a satisfactory assurance by twelve o'clock that night to respect the neutrality of Belgium. Otherwise the Ambassador was instructed to ask for his passports "and to say that his Majesty's Government feel bound to take all steps in their power to uphold the neutrality of Belgium and the observance of a treaty to which Germany is as much a party as ourselves." His account of his final interview with von Bethmann-Hollweg that evening reveals one of the most dramatic and infamous incidents in history.

"I found the Chancellor very agitated," he reports. "His Excellency at once began an harangue which lasted about twenty minutes. He said that the step taken by His Majesty's Government was terrible to a degree; just for a word — 'neutrality,' a word which in war time had so often been disregarded — '*just for a scrap of paper Great Britain was going to make war on a kindred nation who desired nothing better than to be friends with her.*' All his efforts in that direction had been rendered useless by this last terrible step, and the policy to which . . . he had devoted himself since his accession to office had tumbled down like a house of cards. What we had done was unthinkable; it was like striking a man from behind while he was fighting for his life against two assailants. He held Great Britain responsible for the terrible events that might happen. I protested strongly against that statement and said that in the same way as he . . . wished me to understand that, for strategical reasons, it was a matter of life and death to Germany to advance through Belgium and violate the latter's neutrality, *so I would wish him to understand that it was, so to speak, a matter of 'life and death' for the honor of Great Britain that she should keep her solemn engagement to do her utmost to defend Belgium's neutrality if attacked.* That solemn compact simply had to be kept, or what confidence could anyone have in engagements given by Great Britain in the future?"

Already, earlier in the same day, the Chancellor had made to the Reichstag the following blunt statement which speaks for itself:

"We are now in a state of necessity, and necessity knows no law. Our troops have occupied Luxemburg and perhaps are already on Belgian soil. *Gentlemen, that is contrary to the dictates of international law.* It is true that the French Government has declared at Brussels that France is willing to respect the neutrality of Belgium, so long as her opponent respects it. We knew however that France stood ready for invasion.[1] *France could wait* but we could not wait. A French movement on our flank upon the lower Rhine might have been disastrous. So we were compelled to override the just protests of the Luxemburg and Belgian Governments. *The wrong — I speak openly — that we are committing* we will endeavor to make good as soon as our military goal has been reached. Anybody who is threatened, as we are threatened, and is fighting for his highest possessions, can only have one thought — how he is to hack his way through." [2]

An open-minded study of the British diplomacy during the fateful twelve days which preceded Great Britain's ultimatum to Germany cannot but confirm the conclusion that: "It is very difficult to see what more Sir Edward Grey could have done to prevent the outbreak of war between Austro-Hungary and Serbia, which did inevitably, as he foresaw from the first, drag in other nations. He urged Serbia to moderation and even to submission; tried to induce the four Powers to mediate jointly at St. Petersburg and Vienna; he proposed a conference of the four Powers to prevent further complications; he did everything in his power to restrain Russia from immediate armed support of Serbia; he declined to join France and Russia in eventual military action; and even up to the violation of the neutrality of Belgium he still strove to avert the horror of war from Europe." Possibly an unequivocal statement that Great Britain would support Russia and France might have restrained Germany; but such a step, as the representative of the pacific Liberal party and as a responsible

[1] When the Germans subsequently rummaged the Brussels archives they found records of conversations between the British and the Belgians; but these related only to action to be taken in case Belgium were attacked, and the Germans knew it, for we have the word of King Albert that he informed them at the time.

[2] Maximilian Harden, editor of the *Zukunft* — who, previous to the War, was a most vociferous supporter of the German national policy, but who later came into conflict with the Government because of his outspoken criticism of their aims and methods — later expressed himself with even more refreshing candor:

"Let us cease," he wrote, "our wretched efforts to apologize for what Germany has done, and let us stop heaping contempt and insult upon the enemy. We have not plunged into this colossal adventure against our will, nor was it forced upon us by surprise. We wanted it, and we do not appear before the bar of Europe, because we do not recognize its jurisdiction in our case. Our might will make a new law in Europe. It is Germany who strikes. . . . Germany is carrying on this war because she wants more room in the world and larger markets for the products of her activity."

Minister, Sir Edward Grey could not take. Yet vital as were British interests, it required the violation of the neutrality of Belgium to arouse in the country an overwhelming sentiment for participation in the war.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

For good brief accounts of general European history: C. J. H. Hayes, *Political and Social History of Modern Europe* (2 vols., 1916); C. D. Hazen, *Europe since 1815* (1910), *Fifty Years of Europe, 1870–1919* (1919) and *Modern European History* (1917); L. H. Holt and A. W. Chilton, *The History of Europe*, 1862–1914 (1918); J. S. Schapiro, *Modern and Contemporary European History* (1918).

For European Governments and International Law: A. L. Lowell, *Greater European Governments* (1918); F. A. Ogg, *The Governments of Europe* (1916). A. S. Hershey, *The Essentials of International Public Law* (1914).

For general causes of the War: A. Bullard, *The Diplomacy of the Great War* (1916); A. C. Coolidge, *The Origins of the Triple Alliance* (1917); W. S. Davis, Wm. Anderson and W. W. Tyler, *The Roots of the War* (1918); G. Lowes Dickinson, *The European Anarchy* (1916). H. A. Gibbons, *The New Map of Europe* (1914); C. Seymour, *The Diplomatic Background of the War* (1916); G. Guyot, *The Causes and Consequences of the War* (1916); W. H. Hobbs, *The World War and its Consequences* (1919).

For the diplomatic rupture: J. W. Headlam, *The History of Twelve Days*, July 24th to August 4th, 1914 (1915); E. C. Stowell, *The Diplomacy of the War of 1914* (vol. I, 1915); Karl Max, Prince Lichnowsky, *My Mission to London* (1918); W. Muehlon, *The Vandal of Europe* (1918); *Collected Diplomatic Documents relating to the Outbreak of the European War* (1915); J. B. Scott, ed., *Diplomatic Documents relating to the Outbreak of the European War* (2 vols., 1916); Sir A. Oakes and R. B. Mowatt, *The Great European Treaties of the Nineteenth Century* (1918), very useful for reference.

For British foreign policy in general and for Great Britain and Germany especially: J. E. Barker, *Great and Greater Britain* (2d ed., 1910); H. E. Egerton, *British Foreign Policy in Europe to the End of the Nineteenth Century* (1917); Viscount Bryce *et al.*, *The War of Democracy, the Allies' Statement* (1917); Sir E. Cook, *How Britain Strove for Peace* (1914); J. A. Cramb, *Germany and England* (1914); Earl Loreborn, *How the War Came* (1920); E. Meyer, *England, its Political Organization and Development and the War against Germany* (Eng. tr., 1916); Ramsay Muir, *The Expansion of Europe* (1917) and *Britain's Case against Germany* (1918); G. Murray, *The Foreign Policy of Sir Edward Grey, 1906–1915* (1915); G. F. Nicolai, *The Biology of War* (1918); C. W. C. Oman, *The Outbreak of the War, 1914–1918* (1920); F. S. Oliver, *Ordeal by Battle* (1915); G. W. Prothero, *German Opinion and German Policy before the War* (1916); J. M. Robertson, *Britain versus Germany*, an open letter to Professor Edward Meyer (1917). G. E. Schmitt, *England and Germany, 1740–1914* (1916); *Why We are at War*,

Great Britain's Case, by members of the Oxford Faculty of Modern History (1914). See also Louise F. Brown, *The Freedom of the Seas* (1919); G. L. Beer, *The English-Speaking Peoples* (1917); E. Boutmy, *The English People, a Study of their Political Psychology* (Eng. tr., 1904); C. Cestre, *France, England and European Democracy, 1215–1915* (1918); C. K. Hobson, *The Export of Capital* (1914); A. E. Zimmern, *Nationality and Government* (1918).

For a full, excellently annotated bibliography of works appearing in English to the spring of 1918, see G. M. Dutcher, *History Teacher's Magazine* (now the *Historical Outlook*), March, 1918, pp. 155–183, later reprinted in *Collected Materials for the Study of the War* (1918), which includes S. B. Harding's valuable syllabus on "The Study of the Great War," which originally appeared in the *Hist. Teacher's Magazine*, January, 1918, pp. 30–62.

CHAPTER LIX

BRITAIN AND GREATER BRITAIN IN THE WORLD WAR (1914–1918)

PART I

The Opening of the Conflict. — By her fateful decision of 4 August, 1914, Great Britain plunged into a world war which raged for over four and one quarter years, which involved three fourths of the population of the globe, which, first and last, called to arms upwards of 60,000,000 men, and covered a fighting area which included not only considerable portions of Europe, but parts of Asia, great stretches of Africa, and remote islands in the Pacific and Indian Oceans. Owing to the huge numbers engaged and the increased effectiveness of modern engines of war, the destructiveness of life and property has been unparalleled in the world's history. More than 7,000,000 have been killed in combat and 6,000,000 permanently maimed, besides some 14,000,000 less seriously wounded.[1] Of the total forces called to the colors on the Allied side, the British Empire contributed 8,654,467,[2] and suffered casualties of 851,117 killed, 142,057 missing, and 2,067,442 wounded, or 3,060,616 all told. According to a careful computation the direct cost alone has mounted to the staggering figure of $186,333,637,097, of which three fourths has been spent for purely military purposes. The British share in this enormous total has been roughly about one fifth.[3]

Resources of the Belligerents. — Although the forces of the Allies greatly outnumbered the Central Powers — except for the interval

[1] This is exclusive of civilians massacred or starved or destroyed by air raids, to say nothing of millions victims of influenza, an epidemic which war conditions contributed greatly to spread. At a conservative estimate, the total war casualties must have mounted to far over 40,000,000.

[2] Of these the British Isles contributed 5,704,416; Canada, 640,886; Australia, 416,809; New Zealand, 220,099; South Africa, 136,070; India, 1,401,350; other colonies, 134,837.

[3] The British War debt is £7,435,000,000 (about $35,000,000,000) of which £171,000,000 has been loaned to the Dominions and £1,568,000,000 to the Allies.

in 1917–1918 between the collapse of Russia and the entrance of the United States at any appreciable strength — Germany and her allies had many initial advantages. For one thing, she had a superiority in trained officers and men quickly available for fighting. The British had had little experience in handling large masses of men, and, while the French had many brilliant admirably equipped officers, their staff organization was nothing like so extensive and complete as Germany's. Russia had a huge army, which, though it moved more quickly than the Germans anticipated, was slow in getting started. Then Germany had the further advantage of operating on inside lines of communication served by strategic railroads on the western and eastern borders which, under the direction of an autocratic military caste, she had constructed in time of peace. In consequence of her central position and her superior communications and her ability to choose her point of attack, she was able to overrun Belgium, northern France, Serbia and Rumania, though, in the first instance, she profited also from a shameless violation of her pledge of neutrality. Fear of destruction of beautiful cities hastened the surrender of her opponents in many cases, while the same fear handicapped the Allies in driving her out of places she had once occupied. Modern warfare is a highly specialized industry in which equipment counts for much. Here Germany had another advantage, due to years of preparation and patient ingenious application. In rifles, in machine guns, and heavy artillery her initial superiority was immense; furthermore, she had huge stores of high explosive shells, and, for a long time, was firing ammunition made before the war. The Allies at once started to supplement the output of their own inadequate plants by purchases from neutral countries like the United States — though they steadily speeded up their own production with marvelous rapidity. All these factors — together with unity of command in the face of divided counsels and carefully worked out plans in which a remarkably elaborate spy system played a leading part — combined for over three years to counteract the unquestioned superiority of the Allies in numbers and wealth, as well as in command of the seas and the consciousness of the justice of their cause.

Innovations in Warfare. — The employment of guns of heavier caliber and longer-range guns made the older type of fortress practically useless, and demonstrated the superiority of trenches adequately manned with troops and guarded with mazes of barbed wire entanglement, though even barbed wire failed to withstand the persistent bombardment from high explosive shells and had to be supplemented by shell craters and concrete machine-gun nests, known as pill boxes.

Poison gas — condemned by the Hague Convention of 1899 — was first used by the Germans at the second battle of Ypres in April, 1915, and more and more frightful types came to be employed by both sides, chiefly in shells. Zeppelins and airships were first employed in warfare, though the former proved far from successful. Legitimate and effective use was made of these new fighting weapons in scouting and destroying railways and munition plants, also as one of the many means of combating the submarine. On the other hand, they were illegally and inexcusably employed for the bombing of defenseless towns and hospitals, though it has been alleged that the Allies occasionally made use of hospital walls for sheltering ammunition trains. The employment by the Germans of such dreadful methods as poison gas and the raiding of open towns[1] recoiled on their own heads and provoked furious reprisals. Moreover, the air raids over England, though they kept some airplanes at home and destroyed a few munition plants, had — like naval raids on undefended towns — the unwelcome consequence that they aroused the British from their insular security and stimulated recruiting.[2] Submarines were adopted some years before the War, though the Germans did not see fit to take them up until 1906, long after the British. A perfectly legitimate weapon against ships of war, it was cruelly and illegally employed against unarmed passenger ships. The tank, which made its appearance in the Somme campaign of 1916, was a British invention developed from an American farm tractor with caterpillar wheels — a movable fortress capable of pushing steadily forward over all sorts of obstacles.

The British War Aims. — The war aims of the British were voiced at the start and at intervals throughout the war by their leading statesmen with persistent consistency. "We shall never sheath the sword which we have not lightly drawn," declared Premier Asquith, 9 November, 1914, "until Belgium recovers in full measure all and more than all that she has sacrificed, until France is adequately secured

[1] Up to March, 1918, the enemy air raids on Great Britain resulted in 4568 casualties, including the slaughter of 342 women, and 757 children killed or injured. Throughout 1914 the British dropped practically no bombs in Germany. Gradually reprisals began, and in June, 1917, British aviators dropped 65 tons of bombs on German towns, and in May, 1918, 668 were dropped in a single day.

[2] Righteous indignation rather than fear was the general reaction against the German policy of frightfulness. The burning of the university and library of Louvain, 26 August, 1914, for alleged attacks of civilians on invading troops, the execution of Edith Cavell, 13 October, 1915, for assisting wounded English and Belgians to escape to Holland, and the shooting of Captain Fryatt, 27 July, 1916, for defending himself against a German submarine are among the outrages which symbolize enduringly the German methods.

against this menace of aggression, until the rights of the smaller nationalities of Europe are placed upon an unassailable foundation, and until military domination of Prussia is wholly and finally destroyed." Such were the aims of the British. It will now be necessary to see what they actually did to achieve them.

The Condition of Great Britain. — The outbreak of the War found Great Britain unprepared in all respects save in the strength of her navy. In contrast to the navy, the British army was smaller than that of any other considerable European Power. At the most liberal estimate, it consisted of a highly trained regular force of 233,000 on the active list, and 203,000 on the reserve, exclusive of 150,000 Indian troops and a body of territorials for Home defense, amounting to 263,000 at most. Portions of the regulars were distributed in garrison duty and other activities in Ireland and overseas, except in the Self-governing Colonies which provided their own defense. Of the regulars, six divisions — aggregating 60,000 men — were at once sent to Belgium. Although they fought heroically and stubbornly — between the Belgians and the French — to stem the torrent of the German invasion, they were largely sacrificed as a penalty for Britain's unpreparedness. For nearly ten years, during which the storm clouds had been gathering, a Liberal Ministry had been in power, a Ministry concerned primarily with domestic political and social reforms. Their leaders were on principle opposed to preparedness; pacific in intent themselves they sought to close their eyes to the German menace, or at least to avert it by negotiation rather than by armaments. Indeed, when Great Britain entered the war, three members of the Cabinet resigned as a protest against the step. The majority of the people outside, although determined from the outset to meet their obligations, were only gradually awakened to the gravity of the situation. With all their fine qualities of courage and steadfastness the British were, in general, slow and unimaginative. Unmilitary, unsystematic, and liberty-loving, they were constitutionally averse to sacrificing their cherished institutions in order to meet the emergency; skilled labor, for example, was reluctant to yield its hard-won privileges; there was a widespread opposition to Government regulation and control of industry, to conscription, and to all that would enable those in authority to act arbitrarily and effectively. The military efforts of the next four years, mingling blunders and costly sacrifice with magnificent achievement, show the weakness and strength of democracy and the price that the British paid for their unreadiness, due in no small degree to timid tardiness of their leaders in revealing to their people the awful seriousness of the problem confronting them. Eventually,

however, a vast army was raised, officered, and equipped, which, with increasing effectiveness, contributed gloriously toward the final triumph. At the start, England had counted, as so often in the past, mainly on the aid which she could give her Allies with her fleet and with money and supplies, but necessity compelled her to send a force to the western front which came, in course of time, to face fully half — and on occasion more than half of the German hordes — to say nothing of goodly contingents sent to Italy, to Salonika, to Palestine, to Mesopotamia, besides maintaining garrisons in Ireland, Egypt, and India.

German Disappointment at British Entrance into the War. — The disappointment at the British entrance into the War and the spontaneous support with which the Dominions rallied to the cause was greeted with shrieks of hate in Germany, who accused the British of deliberately plotting to destroy a commercial rival, yet professed to scorn her "contemptible little army." The extent of the German miscalculation regarding Britain and the British Empire was admitted in a striking article in *Der Tag* a few months after the opening of hostilities:

"We have been mistaken in so many of our calculations! We expected that the whole of India would revolt at the first sound of the guns in Europe; but, behold, thousands and tens of thousands of Indians are fighting with the British and against us. We expected that the British Empire would crumble away; but the British Colonies are one with the Mother Country as never before. We expected a successful uprising in South Africa; but we see only a fiasco there. We expected disorders in Ireland; but Ireland is sending some of the best contingents against us. We believed that the peace-at-any-price party was all-powerful in England; but it has disappeared in the general enthusiasm aroused by the war against England. We considered that England was degenerate and incapable of becoming a serious factor in the war; but she has proved our most dangerous enemy."

The Opening of the Campaign of 1914 and the Sweep through Belgium. — The French were strongly fortified on their eastern or Alsace-Lorraine frontier from Luxemburg to Switzerland, which was guarded by the four great fortresses behind which they massed their troops in anticipation of a German attack. On the other hand, depending on the Treaty of 1839, they had left their northern or Belgian frontier weakly fortified. Hence the German plan to sweep through Belgium, reduce the two Belgian fortresses of Liége and Namur — which guarded the valley of the Meuse as well as the railroad from Cologne to Brussels and Antwerp — pour into the plains of northern France, envelop and destroy the French army, capture Paris, collect


NORTH SEA
ENGLAND
ENGLISH CHANNEL
NETHERLANDS
Strait of Dover
Calais
Dover
Folkestone
Ashford
Canterbury
Ramsgate
Margate
Dungeness
Le Gris-Nez
Boulogne
Guines
St.Omer
Ypres
Dunkirk
Gravelines
Bruges
Ostend
Blankenberghe
Zeebrugge
Knocke
Middelkerke
Nieuport
Furnes
Dixmude
Thielt
Roulers
Courtrai
Ghent
Eecloo
St.Nicholas
Termonde
Alost
Brussels
Grammont
Enghien
Audenarde
Tournai
Ath
Lille
Fontenoy
Mons
Jemappes
Maubeuge
Valenciennes
Douai
Arras
Cambrai
Solesmes
Avesnes
Landrecies
Le Cateau
Bapaume
Albert
Amiens
Abbeville
St.Valery-sur-Somme
Eu
Dieppe
Aumale
Neufchâtel
Serquex
Blangy
Rouen
Gournay
Elbeuf
Louviers
Les Andelys
Gisors
Beauvais
Crillon
Breteuil
Montdidier
Roye
Nesle
Chauny
Noyon
La Fère
Laon
Soissons
Compiègne
Clermont
Liancourt
Pont St.Maxence
Chantilly
Senlis
Meaux
Lagny
Nogent l'Artaud
La Ferté-sous-Jouarre
Château Thierry
Meaux
Epernay
Châlons-sur-Marne
Rheims
Fismes
Craonne
Berry-au-Bac
Guise
Vervins
Ribemont
Saint Quentin
Hirson
Rumigny
Marle
Chaumont-Porcien
Novion-Porcien
Sissonne
Montmirail
Esternay
Sézanne
Mailly
Provins
Nangis
Melun
Fontainebleau
Soligny-les-Etangs
Nogent-sur-Seine
Arcis-sur-Aube
Troyes
Piney
Vierrières
Sens
Cerisiers
Villeneuve-sur-Yonne
Chaource
Joigny
Tonnerre
Ligny-le-Châtel
Auxerre
Chablis
Coulanges-la-Vineuse
Vermenton
Montbard
Montargis
Courtenay
Cheroy
Nemours
Malesherbes
Pithiviers
Janville
Orléans
Beaune-la-Rolande
Château-Landon
Pellegrue
Etampes
Voves
Illiers
Chartres
Auneau
Courville
Dreux
Neauphle-le-Vieux
Versailles
Rambouillet
Nogent-le-Roi
Corbeil
Jouy-le-Châtel
Villeneuve-le-Comte
Coulommiers
La Ferté-Gaucher
Meaux
Mantes
St.Germain
PARIS
Lagny
Crecy
Rebais
Montmirail
Dammartin
Beaumont
Ermenonville
Pont St.Maxence
Villers-Cotterets
Betz
Lizy
Oise
Aisne R.
Marne R.
Ourcq R.
Seine R.
Yonne R.
Loire R.
Vendôme
Blois
Gien
Briare
Montargis
Courtenay
Cheroy
Nemours
Fontainebleau
Melun
Nangis
Provins
Coulommiers
Meaux
Lagny
Versailles
Rambouillet
Chartres
Dreux
Evreux
Pont-Audemer
Lisieux
Honfleur
Le Havre
Fécamp
Yvetot
Dieppe
Neufchâtel
Gournay
Beauvais
Clermont
Compiègne
Soissons
Laon
Rheims
Epernay
Châlons-sur-Marne
Sedan
Mézières
Charleville
Rocroi
Hirson
Avesnes
Maubeuge
Valenciennes
Douai
Arras
Cambrai
Bapaume
Albert
Amiens
Abbeville
Boulogne
Calais
Dunkirk
Ypres
Lille
Tournai
Mons
Brussels
Ghent
Bruges
Ostend
Zeebrugge
Knocke
Blankenberghe
Middelkerke
Nieuport
Furnes
Dixmude
Thielt
Roulers
Courtrai
Audenarde
Alost
Termonde
Eecloo
St.Nicholas
Ramsgate
Margate
Canterbury
Ashford
Folkestone
Dungeness
Le Gris-Nez
Guines
St.Omer
Etaples
Montreuil
Waben
Hesdin
St.Pol
Doullens
Albert
Péronne
Roye
Nesle
Ham
Saint Quentin
Ribemont
Guise
Vervins
Hirson
Rumigny
Marle
Chaumont-Porcien
Novion-Porcien
Sissonne
Laon
Craonne
Berry-au-Bac
Fismes
Rheims
Châlons-sur-Mar


WAR AREA
OF
WESTERN EUROPE
SCALE OF MILES
0 5 10 20 30 40 50
Railroads
Canals
NETHERLANDS
BELGIUM
LUXEMBURG
GERMANY
FRANCE
SWITZERLAND
Krefeld
Barmen
Elberfeld
Düsseldorf
Solingen
Neuss
Munchen Gladbach
Venlo
Maeseyck
Baelen
Hasselt
Maastricht
Tongres
Bassenge
Visé
Liége
Verviers
Spa
Huy
Perwez
Durbuy
Mormont
Marche
Larochc
Bastogne
Wiltz
Diekirch
Echternach
Florenville
Arlon
Montmédy
Longwy
Saulnes
Stenay
Longuyon
Spincourt
Landres
Conflans
Briey
Thionville
Sierck
Bolchen
St. Avold
Metz
Verny
Pagny
Toul
Nancy
Void
Ligny
Bar-le-Duc
Commercy
Mesnil
Vaucouleurs
Joinville
Neufchâteau
Dommartin
Mirecourt
Chatenois
Andelot
Bourmont
Chaumont
Nogent
Bourbonne les Bains
Langres
Bize
Varennes
St. Loup
Senoncourt
Jussey
Chaudenay
Chassigny
Sceu-sur-Sône
Champlitte
Vesoul
Luxeuil
Confans
Lure
Belfort
Le Thillot
Remiremont
Gérardmer
Bruyères
Epinal
Col du Bonhomme
Col du Ste. Marie
Raon
Badonviller
Celles
Grandfontaine
St. Blaise
Schirmeck
Molsheim
Strassburg
Kehl
Zabern
Saarburg
Saarunion
Altdorf
Delme
Château Salins
Nomeny
Dieuze
Flestingen
Hagenau
Rastatt
Baden
Carlsruhe
Landau
Weissenburg
Bitsch
Saarbrücken
Zweibrücken
Pirmasens
Saargemünd
Saarlouis
Neunkirchen
Saarburg
Merzig
Tholey
Kaiserslautern
Mannheim
Neustadt
Speyer
Germersheim
Worms
Winnweiler
Kirn
Kreuznach
Sobernheim
Birkenfeld
Meisenheim
Trier
Saarburg
Wittlich
Zell
Bingen
Mainz
Oppenheim
Wörrstadt
Gernsheim
Darmstadt
Wiesbaden
Frankfort
Coblenz
Adenau
Ahrweiler
Bonn
Euskirchen
Aix-la-Chapelle
Duren
Julich
Cologne
Mulheim
Berghelm
Munchen Gladbach
Rheydt
Neuss
Düsseldorf
Elberfeld
Barmen
Solingen
Lahr
Alt Breisach
Neu Breisach
Colmar
Freiburg
Kruth
Urbeweiler
Thann
Aspach
Sennheim
Burbaupt
Mulhausen
Altkirch
Lörrach
Waldshut
Seppois
Basel
Rhine R.
Moselle R.
Meuse R.
Roer R.
Rhine R.
Ill R.
Aar R.
Ourthe R.
Lesse R.
Semois R.
Sambre R.
Chiers R.
Saar R.
Nied R.
Seille R.
Meurthe R.
Madon R.
Vair R.
Ornain R.
Marne R.
Aisne R.
Suippe R.
Aire R.
Saône R.
Ognon R.
Doubs R.
Lauter R.
Main R.
Neckar R.
Enz R.
Murg R.
Kinzig R.
Elz R.
Dreisam R.
Wiese R.
Birs R.
Aare R.
Reuss R.
Limmat R.
Zurich L.
Constance L.
Greenwich
from
6°
7°
8°
51°
50°
49°
48°

an indemnity and put an end to the war before Russia could strike an effective blow in the East and before the British could send effective aid. Several factors combined, in spite of many reverses suffered by the Allies, to prevent the realization of this ruthless plan. Although Liége and Namur were soon reduced by heavy artillery, their defenders delayed the German invaders long enough to enable the British expeditionary force to arrive and to enable the French commander Joffre to send forces to the north. He failed, to be sure, in an attempt to menace the German left wing by an abortive thrust toward the Rhine country, and the combined Anglo-French force was not sufficiently large or well equipped to render effective aid to the Belgian army — which took refuge in Antwerp 20 August. Indeed the British — under General French — and the French contingents sent to support them, went so far north as to expose themselves to serious peril. Forced to withdraw from Mons on 23 August, the British regulars in a five days' retreat manifested a dogged constancy which stands out as one of the magnificent feats of history, notwithstanding the fact that they gave ground too slowly for safety. Yet, while the Anglo-French troops were forced back, they were neither encircled nor crushed, and the Germans failed to take advantage of the opportunity to seize Calais and the other Channel ports, which would have been invaluable to them for blocking the short line of communication from England to France and for hostile bases against Great Britain. Joffre had hoped to make a stand north of Paris but did not feel himself strong enough, even though the Germans had begun to grow weary in their strenuous advance and were outrunning their heavy guns. Accordingly, he continued his retreat to the Marne, east and south of Paris, where he prepared to give battle.

"**The Miracle of the Marne**" (**6–9 September, 1914**). — On 5 September Joffre gave orders to his army to stand and advance or die. The main battle, lasting four days, involved some 2,000,000 men, and was largely fought within a few miles east of the French capital, though troops were drawn up along a front of 150 miles from Paris to Verdun. The British contingent under General French were contained by a German cavalry screen and played no noticeable part in the battle, though their belated advance has been attributed to French's rigid adherence to orders from Joffre. The miraculous victory of the Marne proved to be one of the decisive battles in the world's history, for it wrecked the German design of putting the French out of the war, forced the invaders to dig in, and took from them the initiative which they never thoroughly regained on the western front till the spring of 1918.

The Retreat to the Aisne and the Race for the Channel Ports. — After their defeat at the Marne, the Germans began, 10 September, to retreat to the Aisne, where they were able to check the pursuit of the French and British and to secure their position in strong trenches. Then began a series of movements on the part of Joffre to outflank his enemy on the west, on the Germans' part to extend their line, with the twofold aim of frustrating the Allies' design and of securing the Channel ports, realizing only too late the chance they had missed during their southern advance. Farther north, they succeeded in capturing Antwerp, the third and last of Belgium's fortified places; but they failed to entrap the Belgian army. Unhappily, however, they secured a long stretch of the Belgian seacoast, including Zeebrugge and Ostend, which they later used to great effect as submarine bases.

The First Battle of Ypres. — Meantime, early in October, there had begun a furious struggle on the part of the Allies, which lasted until the middle of November, to prevent the Germans from breaking through the forty-mile line between La Bassée and the sea and seizing the Channel ports farther south. The conflict is generally known as the First Battle of Ypres, from the town about which the fighting centered. General Foch, who was in general command of the combined forces of the British, French, and Belgians, gave new evidence of his remarkable gifts. The supreme heroes of Ypres, however, were the British troops, and here most of what were left of French's "Old Contemptibles" were practically wiped out. With a total strength of 150,000 at most — many of them hurried from the farm, the shop, and the factory — armed largely with rifles, for they were only inadequately supplied with artillery, they valiantly and effectively blocked the attacks of a trained army of fully 500,000 Germans, abundantly provided with heavy cannon and machine guns. Had the enemy broken through, they would again have threatened Paris, they would have secured the Channel ports, thus cutting the short line of communications, of transport and supply from England to northern France, they would have dominated the Channel and have threatened England's very existence.

The End of the Campaign of 1914. — The close of the campaign of 1914 marked the end of the period of preliminary maneuvering. The line was fixed from the Flanders seacoast to the Swiss mountains. Now began more than three years of trench warfare — with a more or less considerable swaying back and forth of the respective forces engaged — which in a sense must be regarded as one great battle. Not till 1918 was there to be any prolonged or extensive open fighting. It

was in this third and final stage that the issue was decided. To return to 1914, the British had sent all their available forces to help stem the invading hordes; the Germans had failed in their major aim of securing Paris and the Channel ports, of crushing the Anglo-French army and forcing a decision in the first year of the war; but they were in possession of all of Belgium save a small corner along the southern coast, and had torn from France the flower of her mining and industrial region. British troops were sent into the trenches between the Belgians and the French, and, starting with a few miles, came to hold a constantly increasing portion of the line. At the same time their fleet was commanding the seas while their army was being built up and equipped, while the French were developing new manufacturing centers and while the Dominions were sending food and troops, and the United States and other neutral countries were providing munitions and foodstuffs.

The Eastern Campaign. — Meantime, the Russians — on whom the rank and file, at least, in the Allied countries built high hopes — had exercised an appreciable influence on the western campaign. Mobilizing more quickly than the Germans had expected, they sent invading forces into East Prussia and Galicia. In spite of crushing defeats in East Prussia, their activity, together with Serbia's successful defense of her territory against the Austrians, diverted enemy contingents which the Germans might have used with telling effect in the Marne campaign. On the other hand, Turkey's entrance on the side of the Central Powers, November, 1914, was a decided handicap to the Allies, for it cut off the chance of sending, through the Dardanelles and the Bosphorus, the munitions which Russia needed for her huge but badly equipped forces, and, at the same time, deprived the Allies of Russian grain.

The Campaign of 1915. — Circumstances caused the Germans, in the spring of 1915, to transfer their main offensive from the west to the east. Whereas their aim in 1914 had been to contain Russia and to crush France, their aim in 1915 was, as far as possible, to refrain from offensive operations on the western front, and, with relatively few men, to hold the line by means of elaborate trenches, protected by barbed wire entanglements and by a greatly superior equipment in heavy artillery, machine guns, trench mortars, and hand grenades. This would leave them comparatively free to concentrate against Russia, not only to relieve the pressure on Austria, but, as they hoped, to strike the Russians hard enough to force on them a separate and disadvantageous peace. Indeed Germany cherished the further design of crushing Serbia, bringing Bulgaria and Greece into a pan-

German alliance, and thus realizing her ambition of a Middle-Europe and a Middle-Asia which would extend from Berlin to the Persian Gulf. Although, by the German quiescence on the western front, the British were given fifteen more months to prepare, they and the French lost many men in a policy of " nibbling " or attrition, interspersed with a series of offensives which, although they aroused high hopes in their initial stages, regained little territory at great cost, though they achieved something in wearing down the enemy as well.

Russian Reverses. — Before many weeks, the Central Powers gained alarming successes in the East. On 1 May, in the great battle of the Dunajec, the Russian advance in Galicia was decisively stopped, and by June the invaders were driven from the country. Then the Austro-German armies in the south were able to combine with German armies from the north and west against Russian Poland. On 4 August Warsaw fell, and the advent of winter found the Russians forced well back beyond their border. Woefully lacking supplies and equipment and with little enthusiasm for the old régime, they had fought manfully; but, though they were to return for one more splendid offensive, suffering, treachery, and disintegration were at work that were to paralyze their efforts early in 1917.

Italy in the War. — Already, in May, 1915, Italy had entered the war on the Allied side, an acquisition which brought many advantages, together with some complications. She contributed a fine navy, closed useful neutral ports to the enemy, and gave the Allies another Mediterranean base; also she protected southern France against an Austro-German attack and diverted the energies of Austria on the Italian frontier. At the same time she had nationalistic ambitions which awakened the apprehension of the Slavs under Hapsburg rule, rousing them to fight for a cause toward which they had hitherto been lukewarm, and ambitions, too, which crossed with those of Greece and embarrassed seriously the Allies in their dealings with the latter State. Valiantly as she hurried to the attack, Italy was able to accomplish little during the first year of the war: she was lacking in munitions, she had to undertake the almost superhuman task of driving her enemy from the passes of the Austrian Alps which projected into the plain of northern Italy and threatened her flank and rear, while she sought to make head against the Austrian forces dug in on the farther side of the Isonzo.

Gallipoli (1915–1916). — Meantime, the British had entered on an adventure in the Eastern Mediterranean which proved to be one of the most tragic miscarriages in the whole war, though it called forth imperishable manifestations of high-hearted courage and self-sacrifice.

The aim was to force the Dardanelles, guarded on the north by the peninsula of Gallipoli, in order, among other things, to open the sea route to Russia and to prevent Rumania from supplying the Germans with grain and oil. A few obsolete ships might well have been risked in an effort to dash through the straits, though, as the event proved, success was impossible in view of the strong current, bearing destructive mines against the invader, and in view of the hidden fortifications equipped with powerful Krupp guns. When the surprise attack failed, the attempt should have been given up. The only other possibility would have been to refrain from disclosing the design until the land forces were ready to coöperate. The British did neither one thing nor the other. In February and March, 1915, assisted by the French, they launched a naval attack, and with a loss of two ships, beside having two more put out of action, they scarcely managed to penetrate beyond the entrance to the straits. Against the protests of Marshals Joffre and French, Mr. Churchill — the British First Lord of the Admiralty — insisted on sending a land army to coöperate with the fleet, and the Secretary for War, Lord Kitchener, yielded. The Allied design having already been disclosed, the Gallipoli defenses were rapidly strengthened and supported by a Turkish force of 250,000 men, officered and trained by Germans and operating close to its base. Not only did the Allies have to transport a part of their invading army and most of their supplies a thousand miles through submarine infested waters, but the landing places were protected by barbed wire, as far as the shallow water reached, and covered by gun fire, while farther inland the peninsula was a series of hills rising tier on tier. Moreover, the climatic conditions were dreadful — what with the withering rays of the summer sun, to say nothing of the searching winds of winter — and all water had to be shipped from the subsidiary bases of Lemnos and Egypt. The French contributed comparatively few to the expedition, chiefly Colonials, while the British used, first and last, upwards of 200,000 men, largely Anzacs (Australian and New Zealand Army Corps) training in Egypt.

The first landings were made 25 April, 1915, by the British on the toe of the peninsula and by the Anzacs at a point, farther up on the north side, which came to be known as Anzac Beach. The former were to march north and the latter east, but, in spite of the furious bravery of their assaults, they never advanced more than three miles and one mile respectively. In May, after the enemy submarines had destroyed three British battleships, the fleet with its supporting guns was withdrawn. Sickness, due to the terrible summer heat, swelled the total of the killed. The supreme effort came in August with a major attack,

four miles north of Anzac, supported by lesser demonstrations aimed to distract the Turks farther south. After a preliminary surprise the main advance was unfortunately delayed long enough to repulse it absolutely. Finally, in the late winter, the swoop of the Germans



THE GALLIPOLI CAMPAIGN, 1915.

through Serbia made withdrawal from Gallipoli absolutely imperative, an undertaking which was achieved, in December and January, with rare skill and comparatively little further loss. All that can be said for this glorious but futile sacrifice was that it contained a large force of Turks during a critical period in the Russian campaign. Otherwise it was costly in many ways. It used up men and muni-

tions which were sorely needed on the western front, it lowered the prestige of the Allies in the Balkans, determining the course of Bulgaria whose King was already bound to Germany, and alienated many former Allied supporters among the Greeks. For these reasons, and owing to the great losses, the ability to assist Serbia was greatly weakened.

The Serbian Tragedy (1915). — Twice before, the Serbians had repulsed Austrian attacks; now the Germans determined on her conquest. This would mean control of the Balkans, which would facilitate the subjugation of Egypt and India, and help to realize the great German dream of mastery of central Europe and western Asia. Already, in September, the Serbians begged for permission to attack their old enemy Bulgaria and render her harmless before the anticipated German attack began, but the British and French Governments, nourishing the vain delusion that they could win over Bulgaria, refused. Early in October, after Mackensen, the victor of the Dunajec, with two armies had crossed the Danube, Ferdinand of Bulgaria, who had been deceiving the Allies with false assurances while his troops were mobilizing, finally threw off the mask. His armies struck at the Serbian flank and rear, and cut the Vienna-Salonika railroad on which the Serbians were solely dependent for supplies and an eventual line of retreat. Although an Allied army had landed at Salonika 1 October, it was too weak, and too uncertain of the intentions of the slippery Greek King Constantine, to render effectual assistance. The poor Serbians, suffering dreadfully from hunger and disease, were pushed steadily south and west by the combined Austro-Germans and Bulgarians. A fragment of the troops and peasantry managed to straggle across the Albanian mountains, and were shipped by the Italian navy to the island of Corfu. On 28 November, when the campaign ended, the Allies, except for the inadequate force at Salonika, had no longer a foothold in the Balkans.

The Campaign of 1915 on the Western Front. — Meantime, while Germany was extending and consolidating her power in eastern Europe, the Allies were making small gains at a heavy cost on the western front, with the threefold design of breaking through if possible, of diverting pressure on the Russian front, and of wearing down the enemy forces by attrition. All the while, the British were working to increase, train, and equip their army. In the long run they accomplished marvels; but it took them a good while to realize the necessity of conscription, and to produce artillery and high explosive shells in adequate quantities. Following local offensives undertaken by the French, the British launched, 10 March, an attack against Neuve Chapelle,

on a four-mile front southwest of Lille. In this attack, preceded by heavy drum fire, they cleared the German first line trenches and, to some extent, the second; but, after gaining a mile of ground, they were repulsed, having sustained[1] as well as having inflicted heavy casualties. The only drive of any consequence undertaken by the Germans on the western front, in 1915, was that resulting in the Second Battle of Ypres, which began 22 April. This battle will ever bear an evil memory, for it was here that the Germans violated international law and roused the fury of the Allies by first using poison gas — a crime which was to cause untold suffering to themselves as well as to their opponents. The French Colonials broke and fled with terror, leaving dangerously exposed the Canadians who were ranged next them. With rare fortitude the latter hung on, though it cost a third of their contingent. The struggle lasted five days; but the Germans, if such was their intention, failed to break through to Calais, though they at least succeeded in forestalling for a time the Allied offensive.

Champagne and Loos. — The great Anglo-French effort of the year was launched in the autumn. According to the plans, Marshal French in Artois was to strike at Loos, north of Lens, while Foch was to move on Arras, a few miles south of the great coal mining center. In the Champagne area another French army under General Pétain was to deliver a blow east of Rheims. Thus the German line, in the form of a great bulging salient, was to be pressed at three points. The British gained such a brilliant preliminary success that the Germans were prepared to evacuate Lens; but reserves were insufficient, the enemy counter-attacked and, in the end, Foch had to go to the assistance of his ally. It was in Champagne that the real break through was contemplated; but, here again, high hopes were at first excited which time failed to realize. Both the British and the French had fought magnificently, they had gained some territory and had levied a heavy toll in lives, but they had been unable to divert the pressure from Russia and to save Serbia. Alone, the French were inferior in numbers and equipment to the Germans, and the latter calculated rightly that it would take months to train and equip Kitchener's million. The British Commander in the field was seriously handicapped by an inadequate staff of officers, by lack of high explosive shells and by the fact that men and material which might to some degree have helped him were diverted to Gallipoli. Nevertheless, it was felt that he was too slow to handle the vast and complex machine that was in the making; so, before the end of the year, he was sent to command the Home

[1] Some of the British were sacrificed by the improper timing of their own barrage fire.

forces and Sir Douglas Haig replaced him as British Commander on the western front.

The Campaign of 1916. — By the end of 1915 the Germans were in a very strong position. While maintaining a practical deadlock on the western front, they had achieved a series of striking successes in the east. They had forced the Russians out of Poland and Galicia and were in occupation of a wide strip of Russian territory, they had put Serbia out of the fighting, and had brought Bulgaria in on their side, while the Greek Government was giving them covert aid, and the British, after a costly failure, were on the point of evacuating Gallipoli. Having the eastern situation well in hand, the German High Command now turned to the west again, and, as the leading feature of their campaign in 1916, planned a mighty blow at Verdun — the key of the French defenses on the German frontier — with the design of crushing France before the British could attain their full military strength. The event proved, however, that they had absolutely miscalculated the magnificent resisting power of the French, who, though nearly overwhelmed at first by the deadly thrust designed to " bleed them white " which began 21 February, 1916, had valiantly realized before the close of autumn their rallying cry — " They shall not pass." Also, the enemy had failed to take into account the ability of the British to launch a truly formidable offensive, to say nothing of the fighting capacity of the Italians and the capability of poor exhausted Russia to undertake one more redoubtable effort.

The First Battle of the Somme (1916). — The British Commander, Sir Douglas Haig, offered in the spring to hasten his contemplated attack along the river Somme; but since that would play the German game of forcing the Allies into another premature offensive, the French High Command insisted that he wait till he was ready. Accordingly, in the early months of the year, the British rendered aid chiefly by taking over more of the line. At length, 1 July, 1916, began the First Battle of the Somme, so called because it was followed in 1917 and again in 1918, by further bloody conflicts in this stricken district. The British undertook the major thrust north of Amiens, and had to face the main concentration of the Germans, while the French, still mainly occupied at Verdun, coöperated in a fine but subordinate offensive by way of diversion farther south. The chief purposes aimed at were to relieve Verdun, to assist the Italians and the Russians, and to use up the active forces of the enemy. When the attack opened, General Haig may have had hopes of breaking through, but if so the heavy losses of his men — 50,000 the first day with a gain of half a mile on a seven-mile front — forced him to revert to a plan of steady pressure

and slow advance. This was the first appearance in force of the new citizen army; for the scanty remnants of the "Old Contemptibles" who survived the campaign of 1914 had been wiped out at Neuve Chapelle and Loos. It was a fiery ordeal for untried men and untried officers, and appalling numbers were sacrificed against a huge and wonderfully equipped war machine, which the enemy for years had been employing all the resources of science to construct. Upwards of 3,000,000 troops were engaged on both sides: of the casualties, amounting to 1,000,000, the flower of the young manhood of the British Empire contributed a heavy toll, and they had gained little more than seven miles on a twelve-mile front when the approach of bad weather in November brought the fighting to a close. Nevertheless, they had served their apprenticeship, they had been fashioned into veterans and had proved to the Germans that henceforth, in man power and equipment, they were a force to be reckoned with. They had relieved Verdun, and they had seized the initiative on the western front which they were to retain for over a year, they had inflicted heavy losses and captured many guns and prisoners. They had shown the Germans, too, that their permanent trenches were no longer wholly to be depended upon and forced them, like the French at Verdun, to take to shallow trenches, shell craters and pill boxes. Finally, by their persistent hammering they rendered the German positions so untenable that they were forced to undertake a so-called "strategic retreat" of many miles, early in the spring of 1917.

The Italian, Russian and Rumanian Campaigns (1916). — Much handicapped by lack of guns and munitions, the Italians were able, nevertheless, not only to halt an Austrian attack in the region of the eastern Alps but even to secure a commanding through dangerously exposed position along the river Isonzo, northwest of Trieste. They were greatly aided by a splendid Russian offensive along a three hundred mile front, the rapid progress of which during the first few weeks was later grievously dashed. The Russians, with hopelessly inadequate equipment and transportation facilities and sadly hampered by a Government honeycombed with pro-German traitors, were soon stopped and forced back by the Austrians, stiffened by German reënforcements. Their brief help to the Allies had been rendered at a terrible cost, and hungry, suffering, and discouraged they were ripe for a Revolution which broke out early in 1917. Another disastrous setback for the Allies was the catastrophe that overtook the Rumanians. Entering the war 27 August, 1916, their untried armies fell victim to their own rashness, to the impotence of the Western Powers, to delusive assurances of the Russians, and to the energetic strategy of the

Germans. Almost annihilated by heavy casualties, a fragment of the Rumanian army succeeded in escaping into Russian territory, leaving their country with its rich supplies of grain and oil to the enemy. Three Russian divisions arrived too late to help them; also, the Allied army in Salonika, who, assisted by a few re-equipped Serbians, had been pushed into Serbia and captured Monastir, 19 November, were unable to effect a diversion. Venizelos, the pro-Ally Greek statesman, had set up a revolutionary government in Salonika; but King Constantine was still in the saddle, and the Entente army was too weak and too fearful of his intentions to risk going too far north.

The Peace Drive (1916). — The Central Powers had met with serious reverses during the year, though they were far from being so exhausted as the Allies supposed. Having little more to fear from Russia, Germany, far better informed on the situation than the Entente Powers, now determined to take steps to secure the great Empire which she had been building up in the east. Hence the so-called "peace offer" that she made on 12 December, 1916, which was, in substance, a proposal for a conference for an exchange of views. Her design was to set the Powers by the ears, to strengthen herself with her own people and to win over the majority in the United States, as well as the sentimentalists and defeatists in France and Great Britain, by throwing upon her opponents the responsibility for continuing the War. However, moral indignation and the realization of the German menace was strong enough among the Allied Governments and the bulk of their peoples to repudiate the thought of a negotiated peace, and to continue fighting until they were in a position to insist on such terms as would secure from Germany at least a partial compensation for the havoc she had wrought, and would offer reasonable guarantees for future security.

The Hindenburg "Strategic Retreat" (1917). — The British 1917 offensive on the western front began in March, on the sector from Arras to Soissons. Although the French still held from two thirds to three-quarters of the line, fully half the enemy forces were concentrated against the British, who were steadily assuming more and more of the burden which had pressed so heavily on the French from the Marne to Verdun. Partly because his old positions had been dangerously dented by the Somme attack of 1916 and partly to frustrate the formidable Anglo-French drive which he anticipated, von Hindenburg,[1]

[1] Although von Hindenburg had become the German popular idol because of his achievements against the Russians, the opinion soon came to prevail among the initiated that his successes were largely due to von Ludendorff, who became his Quartermaster-General.

the new German Commander in the West, fell back behind his exposed salients to a carefully prepared system of defenses known as the "Hindenburg Line." In spite of the Allied aircraft and other devices for obtaining intelligence, he was able to withdraw successfully along a sixty-mile front, ruthlessly destroying as he went, and leaving in his wake a devastated shell-pitted country, guarded by a comparatively few men with machine guns. When, in April, the Germans had reached their new positions they took a determined stand, with a strong concentration of artillery between Lens and St. Quentin. Then the British and the French, in an alternating series of brilliant but costly attacks, struck at the northern and southern hinges of the enemy defense. The British, in the so-called Battle of Arras, made considerable headway, the Canadians with magnificent heroism captured Vimy Ridge, an important position commanding Lens, and by June had practically surrounded this great coal center of northern France. The French, too, by one brilliant stroke, in the middle of April, captured 17,000 prisoners and 75 guns; but the toll of death among their men so appalled the Government that they called off the offensive and replaced General Nivelle by General Pétain. The action of the French greatly embarrassed the plans of Marshal Haig, who had to keep on without their support. Then he struck another blow farther north, where he achieved a spectacular success, 7 June, 1917, by blowing up the Messines salient in the German line south of Ypres. While this stroke was preparing for nearly two years and 1,000,000 pounds of explosives were used, the tactical results were less than they might have been, owing to unfortunate delays and the advent of bad weather.

The Collapse of Russia (1917). — Unfortunately, the Allied strategy which had contemplated a simultaneous advance on three fronts — the western, the eastern, and the Italian — was most gravely thrown out of gear by the outbreak of a revolution in Russia, resulting in the overthrow of the old régime and the deposition of the Tsar in March. Huge amounts of supplies had been sent through Archangel and Vladivostok, and it was hoped that the Russian army would open the spring campaign more fully equipped than ever before; but the rank and file were exhausted and discouraged by treachery in high places, and they were worked on by German propagandists. The Constitutional Democrats, who strove to fulfill their obligations to the Allies, were overthrown, and M. Kerensky, a moderate Socialist who succeeded to a brief tenure of power, was unable to cope with the situation. After he had gone too far in relaxing the bonds of discipline, he made a vain effort to start a new offensive, and in July even went to Galicia to in-

spire the troops in person. However, Soviets or councils of workmen, peasants, and soldiers were growing steadily stronger and falling more and more under the influence of the Bolshevists or extremists. The Russian army degenerated into a debating society; ranks and such little discipline as remained were abolished, and, under Lenine and Trotsky, the two sinister figures who succeeded Kerensky, an armistice was concluded with Germany in December, to be followed, early in the following year, by a disastrous separate peace.

The Italian Disaster, and Cambrai. — In the autumn, the Allies had to endure another calamity. The Italian line along the Isonzo was pierced at Caporetto, their armies were forced to retreat and lost the gains of two and a half years, as well as a terrific number of men and guns. However, they finally pulled themselves together behind the Piave river north of Venice, where they held their ground with marvelous heroism, assisted ultimately by British and French contingents who came to their assistance. In November, Marshal Haig sought to create a diversion by a splendid attack on the western front at Cambrai, where the Tanks[1] were used to great effect, in place of a preliminary bombardment. Haig made a splendid gain of five miles; but, before he could secure his exposed salient, the Germans replied by a surprise counter-attack, took back a portion of the ground they had yielded, and prisoners and guns about equal to the number they had lost.

The United States Enters the War (6 April, 1917). — The Germans, who had declared unrestricted submarine warfare 1 February, 1917, were creating havoc with the Allied shipping; but the step had the advantage of bringing into the War (6 April) the United States with her vast potential resources in men, money, and material which were to contribute to turn the scale before the end of another year; meanwhile, British successes in Mesopotamia and Palestine tended, in some degree, to counterbalance the unfavorable situation in Europe.

The Wonderful Year (1918). — The year 1918 was truly a wonderful year, crowded with events and amazing contrasts; beginning with the most discouraging reverses which the Allies had ever undergone and ending with glorious triumph — with the overthrow of the Kaiser and Prussian military autocracy in a series of stupendous battles involving men and destructive machinery on a scale hitherto unheard of. For months, after the discouraging close of 1917, one disaster followed another. On 2 March, 1918, the Bolshevist pleni-

[1] Tanks of a larger size had first been employed, though not with such conspicuous success, in the first battle of the Somme.

potentiaries signed the humiliating Treaty of Brest Litovsk, and its ratification by the Congress of Soviets, 14 March, definitely eliminated Russia from the war, with large portions of her territory and resources in German hands. Next Rumania was bound hand and foot when (6 May) she was compelled to concluded the Treaty of Bucharest. France seemed exhausted, while Italy, grimly holding the precarious line of the Piave, was threatened with inundation from the mountain passes which commanded the Venetian plain. In spite of tremendous and hurried preparations, there seemed little indication that the United States would be able to make her power felt to any appreciable degree for another year. Great Britain, at last thoroughly aroused and equipped, had seen her splendid army thrust at Cambrai largely offset by an unexpectedly effective German counter-offensive; moreover, it was evident that she was to bear the chief burden in a new onslaught, designed to sweep her armies to the sea and seize the Channel ports. Yet, in spite of loud clamors from a few defeatists and a steadily growing pacifistic element, she was doggedly determined, and Mr. Lloyd George reiterated again, in uncompromising terms, the war aims which she must realize before she would consent to peace.

The Opening of the German Offensive (1918). — Although many of the uninitiated thought it might never materialize, the long-heralded German attack was launched, 21 March, with unexampled fury, clearly a supreme effort to force a decision before the United States could come in at her full strength. The chief concentration in the first thrust was directed against the British third and fifth armies on a front of some sixty miles from the Scarpe to the Oise. This tremendous major offensive, before it was stopped early in April, drove a bulging salient into the British line which, at its blunt tip, marked a gain of over thirty-five miles and reached within striking distance of Amiens; moreover, another, and perhaps the main objective was almost achieved, of breaking through at the junction between the British and French forces, rolling up the British right wing, and circling round the French, thus opening again the road to Paris. On 9 April, the enemy started a second and smaller offensive in the Flanders sector, where they pushed the British off the high ground which served as the key to their northern defenses and the Channel ports. The combined effect of these two offensives was to regain for the Germans what the Allies had painfully acquired after months of the heaviest fighting. Owing to a feeling on the part of the French that the British had not been doing enough and that the attack would be divided, Marshal Haig had reluctantly extended his line south of St. Quentin. Thus

weakened, and exposed to heavy discharges of high explosives and poison gas, followed by concentrated attacks of dense masses of troops amply supplied with machine guns, the British, though they manfully held with their backs to the wall, were only able to make a final stand in Picardy and in Flanders. However, reënforcements of upwards of 300,000 men were speedily hurried from England.

The Drives against the French. — Next came the turn of the French. The Germans began, 27 May, with a thrust across the river Aisne between Soissons and Rheims, which forced a pocket or broad loop from Soissons and Rheims down to Château-Thierry on the Marne, less than fifty miles from Paris. In this fighting, American troops, including marines, nobly won their spurs in checking the enemy advance at Château-Thierry, 2 June, and in the capture of Belleau Wood with a nest of machine guns, 10 June. This first great offensive against the French was followed by a second, 15 July — extending from Rheims to the Argonne Forest, north of Verdun — coupled with another subsidiary offensive south of the Marne. Irresistible as the torrent seemed, it was soon stemmed and turned back with terrible effect.

The Beginning of the Allied Counter-Offensive (18 July). — Meantime, the Allies had taken a momentous step which should have been taken early in the War — on 29 March a supreme commander had been placed over all the forces on the western front. General Foch — most properly chosen for the position — had the formidable problem of holding the road to Paris without weakening too far the defenses in Picardy and Flanders and thus exposing the Channel ports; indeed, while defending these vital points he was obliged to keep his whole line strong enough to prevent the enemy, who had the initiative, from striking at any particular spot in overwhelming numbers. At first, he was hampered by insufficient reserves, but soon the 300,000 British reënforcements were available, and the Americans, in response to urgent appeals, were hurried across the ocean in constantly increasing numbers — 1,000,000, it was announced on 4 July, and by autumn 2,000,000. Thus supported, Foch began (18 July) his remarkable series of counter-attacks which wrested the initiative from the enemy and were continued until the whole German army was forced back, overwhelmed and compelled to surrender. The German thrusts between 21 March and the middle of July had resulted in three salients. One was between Soissons and Rheims which looped down to and crossed the Marne in places; here a counter-attack was started 18 July by the French and Americans with such pressure on the two sides that the Germans were forced to withdraw to avoid capture. This was the Second Battle of the Marne.

The British Counter-Offensive. — The second salient extended over an eighty-mile front from Soissons on the south to Arras on the north, where Foch launched a second counter-offensive 8 August. In this Third Battle of the Somme the British, with the French coöperating in the south, dealt a series of terrific blows both at the sides and against the front of the salient, with the result that the Germans were driven back to the Hindenburg Line whence they had issued for their great offensive in March. The third move in Foch's decisive counter-offensive was designed to break that line, which consisted of " the most intricate and elaborate works ever fashioned by the ingenuity of man." Furthermore, by striking north and south, the Allies aimed to cut off the German army by the only two lines of retreat open to them, through the valley of the Meuse by way of Liége, and through Metz by way of the Maubeuge, Mézières and Metz railway. On the German right in Flanders — the area of the third salient — were the Belgians under King Albert and a British contingent; in the center, the British were to lead the attack from Cambrai to St. Quentin with more French contingents from St. Quentin to the Oise; while on the enemy left, in the Argonne region threatening Metz, the offensive was intrusted to French and American troops.

The Last Phase. — Late in September, the Anglo-Belgian forces began to advance in Flanders, driving a wedge between Ostend, an important submarine base, and Lille, " one of the anchors of the Hindenburg Line." About the same time, the Franco-American forces struck heavy blows on both sides of the Argonne forest, northwest of Verdun. Then, in October, the British began a magnificent and effective smash along the front from Cambrai to St. Quentin. North, south, and center one telling stroke alternated with another in swift succession, city after city and village after village yielded before the determined advance of the Allies, until (5 November) the Germans had begun a general retreat along the whole line from the Scheldt to the Aisne. On 7 November, the Americans, who shortly after the middle of October had by terrific fighting forced their way through the Argonne wood, pressed up to Sedan, the scene of the French humiliation in 1870. On 9 November, the abdication of the Kaiser was announced, and, on the following day, he and the Crown Prince fled to Holland. Two days later, 11 November, hostilities ceased on the western front with an armistice signed at Rethondes near Compiègne.

The Collapse of the Central Powers. — Germany was the last of the Central Powers to yield, and although her power of resistance was limited, the surrender of her Allies hastened her inevitable downfall. Under the direction of Marshal Foch a series of advances on all fronts

was undertaken in August. Following a period of inactivity, which had lasted since the capture of Monastir in 1916, the Allied forces in the Balkans — strengthened by the accession of Greece, 2 July, 1917 — started a drive against the Bulgarians 14 September, 1918. After two weeks of fighting, the Bulgarians asked for an armistice which was arranged 29 September. Turkey, the next to yield, finally withdrew from the fighting 21 October. Meantime, Italy, who had effectively halted her pursuers on the Piave in June, was preparing for a supreme counter-offensive. With the aid of one French and two British divisions they launched their attack, 24 October, the anniversary of the Caporetto disaster. The result was most spectacular; for in three days they took over 400,000 prisoners as well as 7000 guns, and drove their old enemy in headlong flight across the Austrian border, whereupon the Austro-Hungarian Empire sought terms, and an armistice was granted 4 November.

The Causes of Germany's Downfall. — The causes of Germany's final collapse, which was only precipitated by the successive defections of her Allies, were various. For one thing, owing largely to the rigor of the blockade, Germany was reaching the verge of exhaustion as regards raw material and suffering from an increasingly serious food shortage; moreover, she had used most of her best shock troops and the greater portion of her reserves. The tide was turned by the magnificent counter-offensive of the French in July, and the last decisive effort on the western front was the smashing of the Hindenburg Line. Toward this the French, the Belgians and the Americans all contributed, though the supreme achievements in this last great work were the two great offensives of August and October, in which the British played the leading part. While the unity of command and the military genius of Marshal Foch were indispensable for the final victory, very great credit is due to Marshal Haig and Generals Plumer, Horne, Byng and Rawlinson for the splendid war machine which they had finally completed. First France and then the British had to bear the brunt of the burden. At the most critical stage the Americans began to arrive, and the splendid account which they gave of themselves against seasoned veterans at Château-Thierry, at St. Mihiel and in the Argonne, together with the prospect they could offer of endless reserves, made the offensive possible which finally turned the scale. The legend of Prussian invincibility had been shattered and Prussian militarism ceased to menace the world.

The Armistice. — While the Peace Congress was assembling and preparing its terms, the enemy was held down by the drastic provisions of the Armistice concluded 11 November, and subsequently renewed

with revisions in the interests of greater security. The Armistice provided, in substance, for a cessation of fighting and for the surrender of a carefully specified number of heavy cannon, machine guns, airplanes, railway engines and other material. Also, the enemy were to abandon the invaded countries of Belgium, northern France, Alsace-Lorraine and Luxemburg, and all German territories on the left bank of the Rhine as well. These were to be occupied by Allied troops who were to hold the principal Rhine crossings at Cologne, Coblenz, and Mayence with their bridgeheads for a radius of 18.6 miles on the right bank, while, for additional security, there was to be a neutral zone parallel to the river on this same right bank. In their evacuation the Germans were strictly enjoined to spare all inhabitants and property, to reveal all mines or time bombs, poisoned wells and other means of destruction, and to give up the prisoners which they had captured during the war without any reciprocal assurance that their own would be delivered. In addition, they were to return deported civilians, together with all stocks, securities and paper money taken from invaded countries. They were to withdraw from Russia, Turkey, and Rumania, to abandon the treaties of Brest-Litovsk and Bucharest, and to restore the gold taken by the former treaty from Russia, which was to be held in trust by the Allies. Finally, they were to surrender practically the whole of their fleet, to allow freedom of access to the Baltic, and to assist in sweeping up the mines which they had indiscriminately sown. To help the army of occupation in securing the terms of the Armistice, the blockade was to be maintained as long as necessary. The preliminaries of peace, including a scheme for a League of Nations, were signed by the Congress of the Allies at Paris, 28 June, 1919.

The British Navy. — While, from the very first, the British, with their small expeditionary force, fought manfully to aid France in stemming the German torrent, to say nothing of sending contingents to protect their Empire in distant parts of the earth, it took them years to build up a really formidable war machine. On the other hand, their sea power was able to render incalculable service from the outset, in preventing the Germans from securing a military triumph before the Allies were sufficiently equipped and organized to prevail in land fighting. In view of the crisis, the fleet, assembled in full strength for the summer maneuvers of 1915, was kept mobilized pending the outcome of the Austro-Serbian negotiations and all the tremendous issues which hung in the balance. This was a significant step in securing command of the sea, which was to prove such a decisive factor in the war. Directly hostilities opened, the greater part of the fleet vanished into the mist, concentrating at a station known

to few until toward the end of the War — in Scapa Flow, a great land-locked body of water in the Orkney Islands off the bleak and rugged coast of northern Scotland. Cruising from here as a base and sending forth single ships or squadrons as they were needed, the achievements of these silent watchers were as indispensable as they were unspectacular, except for a few striking engagements. Although no formal blockade was at first declared, the Grand Fleet kept the enemy navy bottled up in the Kiel Canal, and the enemy merchant marine was prevented from leaving home or neutral ports, wherever its ships chanced to be. Such commerce as was afloat, or tried the chance, was soon swept from the seas, and Germany was more and more crippled in her attempts to secure from neutral nations the food supplies and raw materials which, though more self-sufficing than England, she sorely needed. Moreover, 2,000,000 German subjects of military age were prevented from returning home to serve in the army, while the coasts of Britain and France, as well as the French and British colonies, were kept free from invasion.[1] Also the "silent British Navy" kept open the lanes of sea communication for the transport of troops, both from the French possessions and the British dominions; indeed more than 22,000,000 Allied soldiers were, during four years, conveyed back and forth across the seas with a loss of only 4,391. Furthermore, from England, from outlying ports of the Empire, and from neutral countries, all sorts of foodstuffs, munitions and equipment were shipped, while coal and iron were supplied to France and Italy who stood so woefully in need of them. This utilization of colonial and neutral resources obviously went a great way toward counterbalancing the German grip on Belgium and the French industrial districts. The heroic work of British trawlers in mine sweeping, and the increasing effectiveness of the convoy system in the face of the growing submarine peril, are among the further manifestations of the British sea power.

Opening Phases of the War on the Sea. — Perhaps the most costly blunder which can be charged to the British navy occurred at the very start, when the British patrol which was helping to guard the Mediterranean — while the French were engaged in covering the transportation of their North African contingents — allowed two German cruisers, ordered out of Messina, to escape through the Dardanelles into the Black Sea. Failure to pursue them led to serious consequences, notably to Turkey's entrance into the war and to the cutting of the southern line of communication with Russia. On the other hand,

[1] This was accomplished mainly by bottling up the German High Seas Fleet in the Kiel Canal at the very beginning of the War, though something like a dozen raids were made on the British coast by small groups of German cruisers.

not only was the German High Seas Fleet promptly sealed up in the Kiel Canal and the neighboring landlocked harbors, but, within two months, 1,000,000 tons of German shipping were captured and the rest held idle in home and neutral ports. Moreover, expeditionary forces from Australia and New Zealand had been assisted in securing all the German possessions in the Pacific south of the equator, while, during October and December, Japan, who entered the war, 23 August, gathered in those north of the equator and overcame the Germans in their Chinese stronghold at Kiao-chau. All the while, the British cruisers were relentlessly tracking down and destroying such German commerce raiders as escaped, though the *Emden*, perhaps the most daring and destructive of them all, fell to the Australian cruiser *Sydney* off Cocos Keeling, 10 November.

Coronel. — It was a prodigious task to police the waters of the globe and to protect a merchant marine that carried three fourths of the world's commerce, and one heroic but rash attempt resulted in disaster. Late in the autumn, Admiral von Spee, the German commander in Chinese waters, made for the South American coast and concentrated five powerful cruisers off Valparaiso. At Coronel, near the Chilean Coast, the British Admiral Craddock, who was seeking to round them up, ventured to attack, 1 November, with three armored vessels of an older type and one transformed liner. In a heavy sea, exposed to the rays of the setting sun, out-gunned and out-maneuvered by the speedier squadron of the enemy, Craddock perished with 1600 men. One ship succeeded in getting away, and another, on the way to the scene of action, escaped by arriving late. This heroic sacrifice, due to the British reluctance — in view of the necessity of Home defense — to detach and scatter their heavier-armed, faster and more modern cruisers, was swiftly and gloriously revenged.

The Falkland Islands. — Twenty-four hours after the news of the disaster of Coronel, Admiral Sturdee had been dispatched with a powerful squadron of seven ships on a mission of vengeance from the British Grand Fleet. Joined by the survivor of Coronel and the vessel which had failed to arrive, they reached, 7 December, a port in the Falklands for which von Spee, quite unconscious of their presence, was heading for coal. When he discovered his formidable opponent hidden behind a point of land, he made a vain effort to escape, and, in a running fight which lasted into the evening, perished with four of his ships. One cruiser, the *Dresden*, together with the *Eitel Friedrich* — an armed liner which had joined his squadron — escaped and roved about till the spring of 1915. The Eitel Friedrich was eventually interned in an American port, while the Dresden was finally rounded up at

Juan Fernandez, where, after a show of fight, she surrendered but was so badly damaged that she sank — the last German cruiser to engage on the high seas.

Heligoland Bight. — Some weeks before, the British Admiralty, 28 August, 1914, had undertaken a sea attack at Heligoland Bight, the channel between the island of Heligoland and the mouth of the Elbe. Heligoland, which the Germans since its acquisition in 1890 had thoroughly fortified at a cost of £10,000,000, guarded the western exit of the Kiel Canal and served as a wireless outpost and a base for submarines, airplanes, zeppelins, and destroyers. The British design was to cut off German light cruisers which were patrolling this area, and, if possible, to tempt heavier craft to come to their rescue. In the skirmish which ensued, while they succeeded — with some damage to their own vessels — in sinking three light cruisers and two destroyers, they learned that this heavily fortified, mine- and submarine-infested area was practically impregnable, that their best policy was to hold their fleet in readiness at Scapa Flow, constantly sending out cruising parties to defend their coast, to intercept commerce and to seek engagements with the enemy warships whenever they should come out.

German Raids. — The Germans, on their part, attempted occasional raids with light swift cruisers, hoping to terrorize the English, to cheer their own people, and to keep the Grand Fleet on the defensive, while they sought to draw small patrolling forces to pursue them, scattering floating mines as they fled. The first of these raids, directed against Yarmouth, 3 November, 1914, caused little damage; the second, 16 December, along a coast of undefended towns, resulted in the slaughter of a number of civilians, women and children among them, and in serious injury to churches and dwelling houses. Instead of terror, a fury of resentment was aroused, and many, hitherto apathetic, flocked to the colors. A third raid, 24 January, 1915, was frustrated by Admiral Beatty. The invaders turned tail when he sighted them, and in the running fight, known as the Battle of Dogger Bank, one of the slower German cruisers, the *Blücher*, was sunk and two others were apparently seriously damaged before the invaders reached their mine fields. While they injured more than one of their pursuers, and while in this form of offensive — just as in attacking transports — the Germans had the advantage of choosing their own time and place, they attempted no further coast raids for more than a twelvemonth. After a German submarine, 21 September, 1914, had, in half an hour, sunk three cruisers of one of the older types, two of them in attempting to rescue the first, the British learned another lesson — that the most effective patrol against these undersea pests could only be performed by small

high-power craft, and that there was serious danger in slowing down for rescue.

The Battle of Jutland, 31 May, 1916. — In spite of a frequently and fervently expressed wish for *Der Tag*, or the day when their fleet might meet that of Great Britain in a decisive struggle for the supremacy of the seas, the Germans were only willing — and no doubt quite naturally — to fight on their own terms, off their own coast, where they could retreat and lure their opponents to chase them into shallow waters teeming with mines and submarines. "The Day" came, whether by chance or design is uncertain, in the stupendous and complicated engagement known as Battle of Jutland or Skager Rak. In the early afternoon of 31 May, 1916, Admiral Beatty, cruising with a squadron off the Danish coast on his way north to join Admiral Jellicoe, who, with the greater part of the Grand Fleet, was in the neighborhood of southern Norway, received information that the Germans were out in full force. In the first stage of the action which followed, Admiral Beatty turned south and chased the advance guard of the enemy cruisers till they were joined by the remainder of the High Seas Fleet. In the second stage, he swung north toward Admiral Jellicoe who, in response to signals from his second in command, was hurrying south. Making a running fight against superior odds, Admiral Beatty's design was to hold the enemy until his chief could arrive and inflict a crushing blow. However, the third and final stage proved indecisive; for, when Admiral Jellicoe reached the point of engaging, it was already seven in the evening, and von Scheer, with the aid of a deepening North Sea mist and heavy smoke screens, succeeded in escaping to his base. Cautiously declining to enter the mine and submarine area which guarded the entrance to the Kiel Canal, the British hovered about the scene of action till the afternoon of the following day; but the enemy never reappeared.

At Jutland a tremendous issue was involved; for, had either side destroyed the opposing fleet, the War might have been appreciably shortened. A German victory would have broken the strangling blockade and stopped the transport of troops to the front, while a British victory would have enabled the Allies to tear up the mines, put an end to the submarine bases and open the German coast to invasion. By a hasty and premature report the Germans announced a remarkable victory, while the British Admiralty announced their own losses only, a well-meant but misleading procedure which threw their people — among whom the invincibility of the British Navy was an article of faith — into a momentary panic. The Germans later admitted that, "for strategic reasons," they minimized their

losses, which, in proportion to the number of ships and men engaged, were as heavy if not heavier than the British. Indeed, for them the battle was substantially a defeat, since they had failed to shake off the grip of the blockade or even to interrupt appreciably the normal activity of the British Navy. They never sought to risk another sea battle on a large scale until the culmination, in the autumn of 1918, when their crews refused to fight.

Submarine Warfare. — However, Germany's increasingly ruthless and effective employment of the submarine was to cause the Allies, particularly the British — to say nothing of neutrals — harrowing anxiety before means were devised effectively to counteract it. Already, by the end of 1914, Germany, disappointed in the hope of a speedy victory, had come to realize the handicap of her inferior sea power in a long war. Not only had she lost most of her colonies; but the Allies, thanks to the power of the British fleet, were at once steadily cutting her off from essential supplies and utilizing the whole world for food, equipment and munitions. It was particularly alarming to them that the British were determined to disregard the old distinction between contraband and conditional or even non-contraband without declaring a blockade in the formal way. The British defended their action on various grounds, namely, that, with the development of new methods of fighting, many products had become contraband which formerly had not been classed as such, that, with a whole nation in arms, it was difficult to distinguish between purely military and civilian needs, and that, with the appearance of the submarine, it was impossible to station a fleet in front of a port or along a stretch of coast, as had once been the procedure. Moreover, they could point to the fact that they had recognized the Northern blockade during the Civil War before it was fully effective, and, furthermore, had accepted the doctrine, formulated by the North, of continuous voyage — that goods of enemy destination were liable to seizure, even if they were shipped through a neutral country. Finally, they contended that while goods in ships violating a strictly maintained blockade were actually confiscated, they merely held up and returned or paid compensation for such goods. Nevertheless, if Germany had confined her attacks to belligerents, she might have provoked the United States and the other neutral countries to go beyond the mere protests which they actually made, and have forced them to the length of declaring an embargo. By the wantonly inhuman submarine warfare which Germany felt it necessary to adopt, she ultimately brought the United States into the War, and many other countries as well. British violations of international law, in so far as they are proved to be such, in-

volved only property and could be paid for, while the German methods cost lives which could not. Moreover, there is no doubt that for some time before the United States entered the war, regard for American protests appreciably hampered Great Britain in her efforts to stop enemy trading.

The Lusitania and the Sussex. — A few incidents will serve to show how inevitably the crisis developed. In the beginning of 1915 the German Government took control of the wheat in their country and regulated its distribution. Thereupon, the British declared wheat contraband. This prompted the Germans to announce that: "On and after 18 February every enemy ship found in the war region will be destroyed without its being always possible to warn the crew or the passengers of the dangers threatening," whereupon, they proceeded to sow mines in British waters, and to sink merchant ships of belligerents on sight. Then they decided to extend their nefarious practice to Allied passenger ships. Hoping to terrorize their enemies and neutrals as well, they sank the *Lusitania*, 7 May, 1915, an atrocious crime and blunder as well, which, though it was greeted with exultation in Germany, thrilled the world with horror and indignation. There were intervals, during the following months, when the Germans relaxed their submarine outrages, cessations which the British, prematurely as it proved, attributed to their methods of disposing of these pests, although these methods did force the enemy to slacken their efforts in the waters about the British Isles and to take to the Mediterranean and the high seas. Although President Wilson had warned the Germans that they would be held to "strict accountability," American lives and property were, on more than one occasion, sacrificed to the German necessity which knew no law; but the next acute crisis following the *Lusitania* outrage came with the attack, 24 March, 1916, on the *Sussex*, a British unarmed Channel steamer. Among the list of injured there were two Americans. After a vain attempt at denial, the Germans were obliged to admit — when conclusive evidence was pressed home — that one of their submarines had done the deed. Thereupon, 18 April, President Wilson issued an ultimatum threatening to sever diplomatic relations unless the German Imperial Government agreed to abandon its "present methods of submarine warfare against passenger and freight carrying vessels." On 4 May, the Germans replied that, "both within and without the naval war zone," such ships will not be sunk without warning and without saving human lives, "unless these ships attempt to escape and offer resistance." They proposed, however, to couple this agreement with the condition that the United States "demand and insist that

the British Government forthwith observe the rules of international law universally recognized before the War." The United States refused to make any but unconditional terms with Germany, who, nevertheless, since she made no further reply, presumably accepted the unqualified agreement and, on the whole, observed it for some months, though it was later made clear from a statement of the Imperial Chancellor, von Bethmann-Hollweg, 31 January, 1917, that, from the first, she intended to keep the pledge only so long as it suited her interest. "It was never," said he, "a question of Germany keeping faith, but what would bring success."

Unrestricted Submarine Warfare. — On 1 February, 1917, a new policy was announced of sinking all ships, neutral as well as belligerent, with certain impossibly inadequate exceptions. The plea for this increased ruthlessness was mainly necessity, accentuated by the British extension of the blockade. The purpose was to put Great Britain out of the fighting. "Give us only two months of this kind of warfare," the German people were told, "and we shall end the War and make peace within three months." Unquestionably, this fatal step, which was the final occasion for bringing the United States into the War, 6 April, 1917, was long contemplated and sprung on the world with the completion of a number of swifter and larger undersea craft. At first there was an alarming increase in sinkings which reached its peak in April, 1917, with a loss during the week 15–22 April of 55 vessels, 40 of more than 1600 tons, and from 22 to 29 April of 51, of which 38 were over 1600 tons. Then, with some fluctuations, the losses began steadily to decline. The United States speeded up her building program, while Great Britain, heavily handicapped as she was, coöperated valiantly, until, by the spring of 1918, building finally increased over destruction [1] and submarines were disposed of more rapidly than they were produced. In spite of the manifold activities of the British merchant marine and the British Navy, they were able to transport more than half the American troops sent across the seas and to furnish 15 per cent of the convoys.[2]

[1] During the War it has been estimated that the British lost 7,756,659 tons of merchant shipping by enemy action, together with 1,143,000 by mercantile risk. Of this combined loss of 8,899,659 tons, they replaced by rebuilding, from 1915 to the autumn of 1918, nearly 2,900,000 tons. The loss, by Allies and neutrals, from sinkings was 12,743,674 from sinkings, exclusive of 2,284,044 from mercantile risk. Of this total of 15,027,618 nearly 11,000,000 was replaced by new construction, and 2,500,000 by captured enemy tonnage, leaving a net loss of something over 1,500,000 tons. The estimates are in gross tonnage.

[2] The activity of the British trawlers in mine sweeping was prodigious. It is estimated that they steamed 1,132,000 miles, enduring all sorts of dangers and

Methods of Meeting the Menace. — The submarine menace proved to be a very grave problem. No one sovereign remedy was evolved, but all sorts of devices were tried, with varying success, until, by the spring of 1918, they began to be destroyed more rapidly than they could be built.[1] Ramming and swift zigzag sailing proved of some efficacy in attack and escape. Guns on merchant and passenger vessels afforded considerable protection. Dense smoke screens were also of great value to many a destined victim, while camouflage, or painting in dazzling colors, though it did not serve to conceal vessels, did cause much deception as to the course in which they were sailing. Nets proved wonderfully destructive to submarines at the entrances to rivers and harbors, as well as in the waters about the coast, while mine barrages narrowed the area of submarine activities in many places. Airplanes and hydroplanes and electrical listening devices proved more and more effective in detecting enemy undersea craft, and, after they were located, depth bombs disposed of great numbers. Mysterious "Q" boats, or heavily armed craft disguised as harmless merchantmen, lured not a few of the enemy to destruction. One of the most adequate means of protection that was evolved proved to be the convoy system or sending numbers of merchantmen or transports in a group under the escort of fast cruisers well armed with guns and depth bombs. The last date in which a ship was sunk by a submarine was 2 November, 1918.

Zeebrugge and Ostend. — During the night and early morning of 22 and 23 April, 1918, was executed — after six months of careful planning and preparation — what was doubtless the most remarkable and heroic among the signal achievements of the British Navy during the War — the attempt to block the entrances to Zeebrugge and Ostend, two ports on the Belgian coast which the Germans used chiefly as submarine bases. Admiral Keyes was in general charge of the operation, while Captain Carpenter in the *Vindictive*, accompanied by two old ferry boats, launched an attack on the mole guarding the Zeebrugge Canal and landed a body of bluejackets and marines to create a diversion, while three obsolete cruisers filled with concrete were sunk in the channel leading from the mouth of the canal. Aided by the darkness and a heavy smoke screen, the intrepid little flotilla,

hardships, and, thanks to their courage and skill, whereas 169 ships were sunk by mines in 1916, only 25 perished from that cause in the first nine months of the last year of the war.

[1] It is estimated that the Germans built altogether about 360, of which the British got, in one way and another, some 150 out of a total of about 200 secured by the Allies.

accompanied by a flock of small destroyers, defied star shells as well as a raking fire of machine guns and shore batteries which the surprised Germans sought to turn on them when they awakened to the situation. Two of the cruisers were successfully placed, but the third had to be blown up a hundred yards from the mouth of the channel. Also, an old submarine was run into the mole and blew up a long gap near the shore end. Motor boats detailed for the purpose took off the crews, with comparatively small casualties, before the time fuses exploded. A shifting of the wind to the southwest made the operation at Zeebrugge very hazardous and prevented the success of the undertaking at Ostend, where two destroyers were sunk some four hundred yards from their objective. The whole achievement is all the more wonderful from the fact that 120 long-range guns were concentrated along the shore from Zeebrugge to Ostend. Some weeks later, 10 May, the *Vindictive*, which had figured so gloriously in the earlier expedition, was sent, on a moonless night, for a surprise attack against Ostend and sunk across the channel. Nine German cruisers, reported to be out on patrol that night, never appeared to frustrate the enterprise.

The Surrender of the German Fleet. — After the German crews refused to come out for a final desperate effort, the whole German High Seas Fleet surrendered, in pursuance of the terms of the Armistice, to Sir David Beatty — Lord Jellicoe's successor as Admiral of the Grand Fleet — on 21 November, 1918, off the Firth of Forth. Aside from submarines, 9 battleships, 5 battle cruisers, 7 light cruisers, and 50 destroyers were given up. After some discussion among the Allies, they were interned in Scapa Flow, where, by a lamentable breach of faith, most of them were scuttled by their German crews, under orders from the Admiral in charge, 21 June, a week before the Peace Treaty was signed.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

Frank Simonds, *The History of the World War* (vols. I–IV, 1919). Wm. L. McPherson, *The Strategy of the Great War* (1919). R. G. Usher, *The Story of the Great War* (1920). C. J. H. Hayes, *A Brief History of the Great War* (1920). A. F. Pollard, *A Short History of the Great War* (1920). F. W. Halsey, ed., *Literary Digest History of the War* (10 vols., 1920). Sir F. Maurice, *The Last Four Months: How the War was Won* (1919). J. H. Boraston, *Sir Douglas Haig's Despatches* (1919). Sir A. Conan Doyle, *History of the Great War* (vols. I–V, 1916 ff.).

For England's effort: André Chevrillon, *England and the War, 1914–1915* (1917); Mary A. Ward (Mrs. Humphrey Ward), *England's Effort* (1916); *Towards the Goal* (1917) and *Fields of Victory* (1919); Mr. Punch's *History of the Great War* (1919); Sir George Arthur, *Life of Lord Kitchener*.

Naval. A. P. Pollen, *The British Navy in Battle* (1919). A. S. Hurd and H. H. Bashford, *The Heroic Record of the British Navy, 1914–1918* (1919). Admiral Viscount Jellicoe, *The Grand Fleet, its Creation, Development and Work* (1919). Sir Henry Newbolt, *Submarine and Anti-Submarine* (1919).

For German accounts, see: A. von Tirpitz, *My Memoirs* (Eng. tr. 1919); E. von Falkenhayn, *The German General Staff and its Decisions, 1914–1916* (Eng. tr. 1920); and *Ludendorff's Own Story, August, 1914–November, 1918* (1919).

CHAPTER LX

BRITAIN AND GREATER BRITAIN IN THE WORLD WAR (1914–1918)

PART II

The British Government on the Eve of the War. — Having considered the British military and naval effort in the World War, it is now necessary to see how they worked behind the lines, and how profoundly — for the time being at least — British life and institutions were transformed by the war-making machinery devised. Since 1905 a Liberal Ministry had been in power, interested primarily in improving domestic conditions, pacific and inclined to concession in foreign policy, opposed to a big army or compulsory military training, and only reluctantly agreeing to occasional increases in the Navy. At the outbreak of the War there were three leading figures in the Cabinet: the Premier, Mr. Asquith, a great reconciler, who favored allowing everyone to have his say in counsel and debate and whose policy was "wait and see"; Mr. Lloyd George, Chancellor of the Exchequer, mainly bent on saving money on armaments in order to apply it to his projects for the betterment of the masses; and Sir Edward Grey, the Foreign Secretary, who, while far from oblivious to threatening situations on the Continent, hoped to avert trouble by conciliatory negotiation rather than by armed preparedness. The British people in general were unmilitary, distrustful of change, of system, of Government encroachment on their individual liberty, and prone to muddle through difficulties. Largely unconcerned with foreign affairs, they had plenty of disquieting problems at home to occupy their attention. Organized labor was striving further to better its position by frequent strikes, the militant suffragettes were still on the rampage and the Irish situation was acute. In spite of the earnest pleas of Lord Roberts for a more adequate army, and the solemn warnings of Sir Percy Scott that the submarine would destroy their vaunted naval superiority, the great majority of the British people felt complacently secure in their island fastness and, even after the War broke out, continued for a time to nourish the delusion that they could do their

part to meet the German menace with a small expeditionary force in addition to their fleet, and the resources of the Empire which they could contribute. Gradually they awoke to the situation, which the leaders of the dominant party were all too tardy in disclosing to them in its full gravity; there was much faltering and bungling, but their ultimate achievement in meeting the crisis was marvelous. Most amazing of all was the readiness with which they cast aside their old prejudices and cherished individual rights, and submitted to a degree of Government regulation which, hitherto, no one would have believed possible.

Cabinet and Parties in the First Year of the War. — The first innovation in the Cabinet was to appoint as Secretary for War Lord Kitchener who, next to the aged Lord Roberts, was England's greatest living military hero. Kitchener showed great foresight in insisting, against the prevailing opinion, that the War would last at least three years; he achieved much in the way of recruiting and equipment; but he made the mistake of trying to do too much himself, and of trying to manage, from the hide-bound and torpid War Office, a vast complex organization that needed the coöperation of the best civilian administrative and business brains of the country. The selection of a non-party Secretary for War was quickly followed by a party truce, so that for a while the Government had a free hand, except for the obstruction of pacifists and a few free lances. Moreover, various restrictions which hampered the expeditious action of the executive were done away with.[1] Yet, in spite of the party truce, dissatisfaction began increasingly to manifest itself with the lack of energy, decision, and stability displayed by the Government. The authorities were confronted with a stupendous task — to raise an army of millions which had to be equipped and munitioned forthwith, and, at the same time, to provide for the civilian and check soaring prices, to say nothing of helping to supply and finance the Allies; and the innate tendency of the British openly to air their grievances, to submit all Governmental policy or lack of policy to "pitiless publicity" had no little effect in puzzling and misleading neutral countries where they were seeking to combat German propaganda.

The First Cabinet Crisis (May, 1915). — The first crisis came in May, 1915, and was brought to a head by two facts. One was the resignation of Lord Fisher, First Sea Lord, in consequence of sharp

[1] The right of private members to introduce bills in Parliament was suspended and the whole time was given to the Government; Ministers accepting new offices were exempted from the necessity of resigning and standing for reëlection; also the life of the existing Parliament, which, by the Quinquennial Act of 1911, expired in 1916, was continued by successive measures until the autumn of 1918.

differences with Mr. Winston Churchill, First Lord of the Admiralty, over the ill-fated Gallipoli expedition; the other was the ominous outcry against the notorious lack of munitions which was so seriously hampering Marshal French on the western front.[1] Since the Unionists refused to refrain further from party criticism, the Cabinet was reconstituted, and although Mr. Asquith continued as Premier, eight Unionists and one Laborite were admitted in a Cabinet of twenty-two. Mr. Lloyd George was transferred from the Exchequer to a newly created Ministry of Munitions, where he achieved wonders. Confronted by national necessity, and reassured by the admission of a substantial number of their own party into the Cabinet, the Conservative opposition was once more stayed for a time. Yet, while the new arrangement was far more effective than the old Liberal régime, it too proved unequal to the situation. A Cabinet of twenty-two proved too large and too unwieldy, while the Prime Minister continued to be too indecisive in action. It is true that the determining of significant questions of strategy came to be delegated to a War Committee consisting of half a dozen members of the Cabinet including the Prime Minister, and that some fifty other Government committees, reenforced by business men from the outside, had been set up to deal with various phases of war activity. However, there was lack of coördination, and sometimes the War Committee did not meet for days together.

The Lloyd George War Cabinet and Ministry (December, 1916). — Although the Coalition Cabinet hung on for eighteen months, acute and growing differences developed over conscription, then, after that was carried, over the most effective utilization of man power; over the withdrawal from Gallipoli; over aid to Serbia and pressure on Greece. Conditions at home and abroad grew darker and darker: the stringency of the food situation; the shipping problem; the rebellion in Ireland; the limited success of the Somme campaign; the collapse of Rumania; and the increasing pro-Germanism and defeatism in Russian governmental circles. In the face of all these difficulties there was an insistent demand, led by Lord Northcliffe of the *London Times*, for "a better machine for running the War." Mr. Lloyd George, who had done so much to speed up munition production, became convinced that it was beyond the power of any single man to perform at once the threefold task of acting as Prime Minister, leading the House of Commons and acting as Chairman of the War Committee. Feeling that he was best fitted for the latter work, he

[1] It was later (December, 1915) revealed in a notable speech by Mr. Lloyd George that, while the Germans, with a huge reserve on hand, were making 250,000 high explosive shells a day, the British were making 2500, and 13,000 shrapnel.

made various proposals, after consultation with leading Conservatives, aiming to secure for himself the active management of the Cabinet war policy. When, at the close of hurried and complicated negotiations, Mr. Asquith finally refused to assent to an arrangement which seemed to him to efface himself, Mr. Lloyd George resigned. The Prime Minister, certain that he could not get on without him, thereupon resigned also. After Mr. Bonar Law, the Unionist leader, failed to form a Government, Mr. Lloyd George, on 6 December, 1916, was invited to assume the Premiership.

The Government which he formed was marked by many striking innovations. In place of the old Cabinet of twenty-two he created a special War Cabinet of five. Of these he himself was the only Liberal, and, originally a Radical, he had come to identify himself with the Conservatives in many respects. Another represented Labor. Three were Unionists, one of whom, Mr. Bonar Law, became Chancellor of the Exchequer and Leader of the House of Commons. Exclusive of the Premier and the Leader of the Commons, the members of the new Cabinet had no ministerial duties, the object being to free them from administrative routine, in order that they might devote their whole time and energy to the War. A few changes were subsequently made, one of the most notable being the admission of General Smuts, one of the ex-Boer leaders and a member of the South African Cabinet. However, the total number was never increased beyond six or seven, though Ministers and experts of all sorts were constantly called in for information and advice. Among the other new departures was the appointment of a secretary to keep official records of the meetings. The Ministry, or outer circle of heads of departments, was enlarged eventually to eighty-eight; in addition to the Ministry for Munitions, Ministries were created for Blockade, Pensions, Labor, Food Control, Shipping Control, National Service and Reconstruction. Outside the Cabinet new boards and committees were constantly added, until, before the close of the War, there were over 400. Inevitably there was much overlapping and confusion; but the new system provided a much more effective engine for the immediate work on hand than any hitherto devised.

Conscription. — For more than a year, the British Government relied on voluntary enlistments for supplementing its small expeditionary force. In spite of a showing that was, on the whole, most gratifying — indeed nearly 5,000,000 enlisted from the various parts of the British Empire by May, 1916 — the need was soon realized for a better organized and more equable system. Stimulated by posters, by public exhortation and private persuasion, pressure of employers

and even insult, high-spirited skilled workers left essential industries to go to the trenches, while unconscientious and unsensitive slackers, who were of no use at home, often refused or evaded enlistment. Accordingly, a Bill was introduced, which became law, 15 July, 1915, providing for a National Registration of persons between 16 and 65, with a view to finding what each was able and willing to do. After a further trial of the voluntary system under a Director General of Recruiting, a Military Service Bill was carried, which went into effect 10 February, 1916, imposing compulsory service — with specified exceptions and exemptions, particularly for men in essential occupations — on all male British subjects, between 18 and 41, who were unmarried or widowers without dependent children. By a second Bill, which went into operation 24 June, compulsion to serve was extended to married men between these ages. Still a third Bill of 9 April, 1918, raised the age limit to 50 and instituted a more drastic combing process of persons hitherto exempted on the ground of physical disability or occupation in essential industries. Furthermore, the King was authorized, if need arose, to call on men up to 56 years of age, and to extend conscription to Ireland.

Control of Industry. — By means of legislation, — for example, by successive Defense of the Realm Acts (popularly known as "Doras") — by royal proclamations, by Orders in Council, the Government assumed an increasing control of transportation and communication, industry, property, and man power in both military and civil occupations. The general principles guiding the Government action were set forth in a Defense of the Realm Manual in which it was declared in substance that: "the ordinary avocations and the enjoyment of property will be interfered with as little as may be permitted by the exigencies of the measures to be taken for securing the public safety and the defense of the Realm." Whereas, in ordinary times, the British had been prone to safeguard individual rights even at the expense of governmental efficiency, now, in the face of a crisis greater than the world had ever seen, the individual had in many cases to be sacrificed. Hence the censorship of the mails, the control of lights and sounds, of intoxicants, and places of amusement, internment of suspected persons as well as regulation of prices, transportation, occupations, and financial transactions. Perforce, there was much vexation and ineffectual meddling; but, on the whole, the new system accomplished its purpose uncommonly well. Existing plants were hastily extended for war work, others were transformed and coördinated, while new ones were constantly built. Not only railways and shipping but various industries and commodities were taken under Government control

or subjected to Governmental regulation. Profits were restricted, wages adjusted; Trades Unions were brought to suspend their rules; skilled labor was diluted by unskilled; and women, in increasing numbers, were employed in occupations hitherto reserved for men. While attempts were made to check profiteering,[1] on the other hand, minimum prices for various foodstuffs were guaranteed to encourage production. Rationing of a few staples such as sugar and meat was ultimately adopted, but, long before, distribution was carefully regulated as to price and quantity.

Extension of Government Control. — The need for moving supplies and troops led to the taking over of the railroads very early in the war, though the management was left in the hands of the regular officials, working under Government orders. Later, the canals, unable to meet the competition of the State-aided railroads, were taken over, 1 January, 1917. Export of coal, together with steel, was soon prohibited except by license, while priority in filling orders with preference to munition plants was established. Various attempts were made to regulate prices; but serious strikes forced the Government to take over, first the southern Welsh coal mines and finally, March, 1917, all the coal mines of the country, and a rationing system was practically adopted. Petrol was among the other necessary products over which the Government found that it must assume control. Speculative trading in copper, lead and iron was prohibited. Moreover, the purchase of wool, flax and certain leathers was carefully regulated, with priority of military and national over private civilian needs. "At the end of 1917 it may be said that the whole industry of the country, production, transport and manufacture, had been brought more or less under Government control. The degree of control varied from complete ownership, as with the national munition factories and national shipyards, to the fixing of the maximum output, as in brewing, or, as in the cases of farming, the enforced transfer to public control in case of inefficient production."

Munitions. — Naturally, one of the first essentials was to provide war materials. Orders were placed in the United States, as well as at home, and the navy was utilized with great effect to keep the ocean

[1] The regulation of prices was a most complex and delicate matter with which to deal. There was much outcry against profiteering and some justification for the complaint; but numerous other causes were operative. There were 40,000,000 men drawn from productive work who were still consumers; the Germans had occupied and devastated Belgium and the mineral and industrial regions of France; there was a tremendous diversion to war needs and a frightful destruction of cargoes. Prices were inflated by borrowing and paper money; increased wages to meet the high cost of living sent up prices still further.

lines open, so that these sinews of war could be delivered to Great Britain and Allied countries. During the pre-war days the British had concentrated chiefly on naval armaments; indeed, there were only three Government factories for manufacture of army ordnance, while munitions of war were largely furnished on contract by about a dozen large concerns. During the winter of 1914–1915 sub-contracts were let to 2500 or 3000 establishments which undertook to transform their works into munition plants. As time went on, it was found necessary to take more energetic steps to mobilize materials, machinery and labor. In the spring of 1915, under Mr. Lloyd George — then Chancellor of the Exchequer — as chairman, local committees were organized and the country was mapped out into districts to include "every available factory and workshop" no matter what it had manufactured in the past.[1] Both strikes and profiteering were among the problems that had to be faced. Increased cost of living had aroused widespread resentment among the workmen, they were jealous of their dearly won privileges, most of them had not come to realize the danger to which their country was exposed, and not a few were inclined to drink and idleness. It was necessary to arouse them and at the same time to win their good will by a limitation of employers' profits. On 17 March, 1915, a momentous conference, the so-called "Treasury Conference," was held between the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the President of the Board of Trade on the one hand, and representatives of thirty-five Trade-Unions on the other, at which, in return for a promise to restrict profits, the Government secured an agreement, known as the "Treasury Agreement," that during the war there should be no strikes on Government work, that Trades Union rules hampering output — such as forbidding the use of automatic machines, the admission of semi-skilled and feminine labor — should be suspended, on condition that the wage scale should not be adversely affected. This was a tremendous gain, though some refused to be bound and strikes by no means ceased. The terms of the Agreement, somewhat extended, were embodied in a Munitions of War Act in July. Strikes could be declared illegal and strikers could be arrested. Further steps were taken, with by no means complete success, to regulate the drink problem.[2] In certain areas public houses were closed,

[1] For example, "In one area alone," after Mr. Lloyd George, on becoming Minister of Munitions in May, 1915, divided the country into districts, "shell bodies or the components of shells were being made by a music manufacturer, an infants' food maker, a candle maker, a flour miller, a tobacco merchant, an advertising agent, several brewers, a jobmaster, a glazier, and a siphon manufacturer."

[2] For the sake of example the Royal Family, Lord Kitchener, and others in high places became abstainers during the period of the War. One of the most interesting

and, later, hours for the sale of alcoholic beverages were limited throughout the country. Most men naturally resented the imputation of drunkenness, and, while there was all too much heavy drinking, the majority of workmen speeded up, some from real patriotism, others under the goad of public opinion. Though there were much discontent[1] and more than one serious strike, occasioned by misunderstandings, by claims that the Government evaded its promises, by resentment at soaring prices, and insistent suspicion — not wholly unfounded — of profiteering, nevertheless, the extension of war production was marvelous. By the summer of 1918 about 2,500,000 men and 1,000,000 women were working in munition factories, while, altogether, 4,500,000 were engaged in the production of war material. The three Government munition factories had increased to over 200, exclusive of more than 5000 Government controlled and over 20,000 privately controlled factories and workshops. Every two weeks they were producing as many shells as they had produced during the whole first year of the War, while the output of machine guns was forty times, and that of medium guns and howitzers was seventy times as great in the fourth as it was in the first year of the War.

Ships and Shipping. — Dependent as the British were on ocean traffic for supplying their own needs and those of the Allies, the shipping problem was, from the first, of supreme importance. A shortage in the world's tonnage was felt at once; for Germany and Austria had supplied 14 per cent, and Great Britain had supplied about half the rest. Immediately, the Army and Navy requisitioned 20 per cent, while 10 per cent was diverted to the use of the Allies. Before the close of 1915, all insulated or refrigerating spaces for meats were taken over, transatlantic liners were required to devote 50 to 75 per cent of their freight capacity to the carriage of foodstuffs, vessels of over 500 tons were compelled to have a license to trade, and the importation of all "bulky, non-essential articles was gradually prohibited." At length, in one way or another, 90 per cent of all British shipping was more or less under Government control. What with shortage of labor

steps taken in connection with the Royal Family during the War was the signing by the King, 17 July, 1917, of a Proclamation announcing that for the future the Royal House and Family should be known as the "House of Windsor" instead of Guelph, and that the use of all German dignities and titles would henceforth be relinquished and discontinued.

[1] One serious cause of friction arose over leaving certificates, instituted to prevent competing employers from drawing workmen from one plant to another by promise of higher wages. They were finally abolished in October, 1917, and, from time to time, other concessions were made, in the shape of war bonuses and increased wages.

and with the increased submarine sinkings and the increased naval and other Government needs, the amount of tonnage available for trade purposes steadily shrank. For two years the Board of Trade continued nominally in control of the shipping policy; but its work was hampered by various newly created and overlapping committees as well as by the conflicting demands of the Admiralty and the War Office. The creation of a new department, under a Ship Controller, after the advent of the War Cabinet in December, 1916, did much to speed up construction and to straighten out complexities, though the previous régime deserve much credit for their handling of a vast and baffling problem. The bravery of the seamen in the British merchant marine was one of the most splendid features of the War. Undaunted by submarine or mine they continued steadily at their appointed tasks, supplying food, coal, and other material to their Allies. Of the imports to France and Italy alone, 45 per cent were carried in British ships, and 50 per cent of their coal was supplied by Britain in British ships, to say nothing of vast quantities of steel.

Food Control. — Since, at the beginning of the War, Great Britain imported about 40 per cent of her meat and 70 to 80 per cent of her cereals, the question of food shortage offered the prospect of a grave menace. With a steadily decreasing tonnage, it was felt necessary to insure economy in the use of foodstuffs and to increase the production as well. The effort in the latter direction was of course greatly complicated by the demand for fighting men and for workers in the manufacture of war materials. In order, under these circumstances, to secure sufficient food for the army and the civilian population all sorts of devices were tried. Importation was encouraged and exports discouraged; the Government undertook the purchase and control of certain food staples; prices were fixed; and regulations were framed as to the kinds and quality of food that might be used. Only after various experiments and much hesitation was a limited system of compulsory rationing adopted. Early in the War, price fixing was introduced in the case of many commodities, and the State undertook to purchase sugar[1] and wheat and to sell to the British consumer. In the case of wheat, however, the practice was stopped in April, 1915, since it tended to restrict neutral trade. Early in 1917, however, a Wheat Supplies Royal Commission was set up for the control of grain supplies. Meantime, toward the end of 1915, the policy of requisitioning shipping for the carriage of foodstuffs had been begun, and, in the following January, a joint international committee for Great Britain, France

[1] Normally, two thirds of the sugar, made from beet root, came from Germany and Austria.

and Italy was created to purchase wheat, flour, and maize. As was the case in other fields of activity, numerous committees came into being with conflicting proposals and conflicting jurisdictions. There were regulations to secure a higher percentage of flour from wheat, for the prohibition of wheat in brewing, and for restricting the number of courses of meals in public eating-houses. Then, December, 1916, a Food Controller was appointed " to regulate the supply and consumption of food in such manner as he thinks best for maintaining a proper supply of food." Under Lord Devonport, the first Controller, a survey of stocks on hand and of the uncultivated acreage of arable land in England was undertaken. This was followed by requisitions of stocks, restriction on use, and more price fixing. In February, 1917, voluntary rationing of bread, meat and sugar was enjoined, and, in April, the Government took over all the flour mills. However, there was an increasing shortage of certain staples such as sugar, potatoes and margarine, and " lines of purchasers formed in front of dealers' premises to secure limited allowances." Early in this same year, 1917, a campaign of education was undertaken by war savings committees. Yet, in spite of this work and a royal proclamation urging economy, the net result was disappointing, for the efforts of the conscientious were neutralized, in no small degree, by the lavishness of profiteers and of laborers receiving wages higher than those to which they had been accustomed. In June Lord Devonport was replaced by Lord Rhondda, whose policy was comprehended under three main heads: (1) Elimination of speculation in food by means of maximum prices, restriction of profits, and, in a few necessary cases, by Government subsidies.[1] (2) Transference from central administrative departments to local authorities of much of the work in connection with the regulation of prices and distribution of food. (3) Compulsory rationing, first, in certain specified districts, of one or two commodities, which by the spring of 1918 was extended to the whole country for tea, meat, butter, fats and sugar. This belated but necessary step caused little irritation and eased the situation greatly. Surplus food, sent from the United States, was a great help, and British gratitude was profound when they learned that these supplies were the result of voluntary effort on the part of the Americans.

Agriculture. — All this, however, needed careful adjustment in order not to hamper the work of the Board of Agriculture in encouraging the farmer to increase his production. Various devices were

[1] For example, the price of bread and potatoes was kept down by means of a Government subsidy. A standard loaf was sold for 9*d*., a sum less than it cost, the difference being supplied from public funds.

employed. Waste lands, some of which it did not pay to till in ordinary times, were brought under cultivation. Fertilizers and agricultural machinery were freely supplied, war gardens were started and worked, in early morning and during the long summer evenings, by persons otherwise occupied during the day. City folk were recruited to spend their vacations in the country during the harvest season. Women, college students, school children, boy scouts, Belgian and Serbian refugees, wounded soldiers, and German prisoners (these latter with no conspicuous success) were all pressed into service. By a Bill, which became law in August, 1917, minimum prices, in the case of certain agricultural products, were guaranteed for five years, an Agricultural Wages Board was set up to adjust minimum wages for laborers, and "powers of entry upon land" were authorized, "to secure better cultivation" if necessary. While there was inevitable friction the results were wonderful. In spite of shortage of regular hands, due to military requirements, 4,000,000 acres were brought under tillage during the period of the War; 1,400,000 war gardens came into being, and a grain supply for forty weeks was raised in 1918, as against a twelve weeks' supply in the previous year.

Britain's Financial Effort. — Britain's colossal financial effort has already been touched upon in another connection. As nearly as it can be estimated, she contributed over £8,000,000,000 or one fifth the total amount expended by the allied and associated Powers, of which more than £170,000,000 was loaned to the Dominions and over £1,500,000,000 to her Allies. By raising the normal income tax, and imposing heavily graduated super-taxes on the great incomes; by increasing excess profit taxes first to 60 and then to 80 per cent; by doubling and then quadrupling customs and excises, and by introducing various new indirect taxes the revenue receipts, which were about £200,000,000 in 1914, were brought up to over £800,000,000 in 1918–1919; but, while the annual revenue was increased fourfold, the annual expenditure was thirteen times in 1918 what it had been in the last year before the War; and since three fourths of the amount had to be raised by borrowing, the British national debt mounted from £700,000,000 to over £7,000,000,000, — in other words, it was swelled tenfold. While the British people, in spite of heavy burdens, loyally contributed to succeeding loans as they were issued, very considerable sums had to be raised in the United States, and American securities, held by British subjects, were taken for collateral, the holders being compensated with British Government certificates of indebtedness. Of all the European Powers involved in the War, Great Britain is the only one paying from taxes the interest — and indeed something more

— on her debt. In view of the crushing war taxes and the fact that prices nearly doubled during the War, the British contributions to all sorts of war charities, including some £10,000,000 to the Red Cross, are wonderfully gratifying.

The Labor Problem. — Until recently the British Trade-Unions have been — since their legal recognition in the seventies — the outstanding labor leaders, gaining as the results of a long struggle: rights of collective bargaining, peaceful picketing, shorter hours and higher wages. The chief gains have been secured by the organized skilled workers, who, indeed, with the aim of preserving their preëminence over the semi-skilled and unskilled, have, in the past, stood out against the introduction of automatic labor-saving devices. Formerly the great mass of this rather exclusive circle held distrustfully aloof from the Independent Labor Party with Socialistic tendencies, from the out-and-out Socialists advocating State ownership and control, and also from the Syndicalists whose slogan has been ownership and control of industry by the workers themselves. While the unskilled and unorganized have been the chief sufferers from grinding poverty, deplorable living conditions, sweating, and inability to improve their conditions, the more favored have also not been without their grievances: they saw their higher wages neutralized by the steadily soaring cost of living, though they were by no means the only sufferers; many chafed at the monotony of their daily tasks — an inevitable result of modern industrial development — and contrasted their lot with ostentatious extravagances of the idle rich; and complained of bad housing and other unpleasant and unsanitary conditions. While those who stayed at home suffered far less hardships, to say nothing of dangers, than those who went to the trenches, the granting of their demands to meet emergencies whetted their appetites for more. Then the concessions of the Trade-Union leaders in the Treasury Agreement and the Munitions Act caused many to lose confidence in and to repudiate their leaders. Some were material, no doubt; others were idealistic and began to have visions of a better and fairer world if the capitalist were eliminated and the workers or the State controlled the mines, the railways and the factories; moreover, they came to think that the interests of the plain people all over the world were one, and that wars would cease so soon as plain people were in the saddle. They began to feel that the existing system of political representation gave no adequate voice to labor as such; not a few began to look toward the Soviet for the control of affairs domestic and foreign. More and more, the strike, or direct action, extended its appeal as an immediate means of gaining what they wanted. As to the ultimate

industrial solution, views were vague and conflicting; but there was an increasing agreement that what numbers regarded as industrial slavery should cease, that, while reduction of hours and increase of wages were an essential, the great industries should be nationalized, and labor should have a voice in management.

The so-called national guild system whereby the State should furnish the material, and organized labor should control its production and distribution, has been strenuously advocated by not a few. Two years before the War was over, many sought to realize this second aim immediately by an extension of the so-called shop steward movement. Repudiating the Trade-Union leaders, partly because they resented the tying of the hands of labor by the Treasury Agreement of 1915, particularly the suspension of the right to strike, and partly because they felt that the Trade-Unions did not go far enough, even in normal times when their rules were operative, they undertook by direct action to secure recognition of the shop steward system. The first big move was a munition strike at Coventry in November, 1917, and was followed, during the next year, by more strikes in munition and aëroplane plants. While the Trade-Unions aimed to control a particular industry and to secure their general policies by legislation, the shop steward advocates planned to control each plant by a committee, all industries, grouped into districts, by a representative committee of the district, and all the industries of the land by a representative national committee. In short, they aimed at an industrial political Soviet system, arguing that "modern representative government" was "merely middle-class government masquerading as democracy," and that, even if workmen were better paid, fed and housed, they were no better than industrial slaves.

The Report of the British Labor Committee. — In order the better to voice the demands of the industrial classes, the British Labor Party appointed, before the close of 1917, a committee on reconstruction. The momentous report which it issued, together with an authoritative little book on *The Aims of Labor* by Mr. Arthur Henderson, Secretary of the Labor Party, and for some months a member of the War Cabinet, indicates the extreme lengths to which the Party had progressed during the War. In general, Labor now seeks: "to establish democratic control over all the machinery of State," and of "all activities of society"; to create a "nation-wide political organization . . . in which the members will be enrolled both as workers and as citizens"; and to include women as well as men, moreover, workers with the brain as well as hand. Their purpose is to do away with the individualistic capitalistic system, substituting for it, so far as possible, common

ownership of land and capital. As steps to this end they insist that the great industries and services — such as the mines and the railroads — which had been taken from the hands of private capitalists during the War should be retained under Government control. Among their other specific proposals are further provisions against unemployment, accident, and industrial disease, measures to secure a reasonable amount of leisure and an adequate minimum wage for all workers;[1] an increasing share in the management of factories; taxation on luxuries and excess profits,[2] with the provision that the money thus secured should be spent on public objects, such as education, museums and the like. Finally, they urge that, since wars affect the common people more than any other class, the Foreign Office and other administrative departments should be brought more directly under the control of Parliament "to give the people's representatives larger powers of criticism in regard to foreign policy." Among their ideals in Imperial and Foreign policy are "Home Rule all round" including Ireland, Egypt, and India; no increase of territory, no economic wars or protective tariffs, abolition of secret diplomacy and the creation of a League of Nations, with the ultimate aim of securing a new social order based not on fighting but on fraternity.

The Government and the Labor Problem. — Meantime, with the advent of Lloyd George's Cabinet in December, 1916, a Ministry of Labor had been set up; but, with the pressing problem of employing all possible resources of man power and material toward the winning of the War, its activities were necessarily hampered. Very early in the War, committees were created to consider the various problems of reconstruction to be dealt with — some necessarily at the close of the conflict — such problems as agricultural policy, coal conservation, relations between employers and employed, demobilization, education, housing, unemployment, public health, post-war trade, supply of raw materials, and various other needs. In July, 1917, the whole work was put in charge of a newly created Minister of Reconstruction.

One sub-committee — which continued its work under the new Ministry — was appointed for "looking toward a more complete program of representation and coöperation on the part of Labor and Capital" in industry. Its report, known as the Whitley Report, from the name of the chairman, the Right Hon. J. H. Whitley, M. P.,

[1] They were especially insistent on some scheme being devised to protect the workers against unemployment and decrease of wages with the demobilization of the Army and the shutting down of the munition plants at the close of the War.

[2] In addition to heavy income and death duties they declared that it might be necessary to levy on capital to pay the War debt.

recommended joint industrial councils in industries and trades — one for each plant and factory, one for each district, and one for the whole nation, each containing representatives of employers and workmen. This was only one of various committees appointed to survey the situation. However, the British Labor Party, with their demand for nationalization of industry and ultimate abolition of private capital, have gone beyond what these committees have to offer, and it remains to be seen whether extreme or moderate views will prevail in the ultimate settlement.

The Education Bill. — One result of the War and the movement for reconstruction was to precipitate an excellent Education Bill.[1] In the Lloyd George Ministry, a novel step was taken when the position of President of the Board of Education was filled not by a political leader but by a professional teacher, — Mr. H. A. L. Fisher, one of England's foremost historians, successively tutor at Oxford and Vice-Chancellor of the University of Sheffield. His final Bill — embodying some of the recommendations of a committee appointed by the Board of Education as early as April, 1916 — which became law in 1918, was one of the few plans of reconstruction brought to a head before the close of the War. Reforms had been considered and discussed for years, and, among other organizations, a Workmen's Educational Association had been active in emphasizing the value not only of special technical instruction but of liberal studies for the children of working folk. There was much in the existing situation that cried for betterment: recent reports of the chief medical officer to the Board of Education revealed the alarming facts that out of 6,000,000 in school, 600,000 were unclean; about the same proportion were insufficiently fed; 3,000,000 suffered from bad teeth, and 500,000 from weak sight. The conditions relating to employment of children of

[1] The immediate effect was greatly to disturb the normal educational life of the country. The higher institutions of learning were depleted to a striking degree. Within two years it was estimated that, from the 54 universities in the Empire, 70,000 students were in service. Oxford, the most ancient and famous, was reduced from 3181 in 1914, to 491 in 1917. And the depletion extended to the secondary schools, among girls as well as boys. So great were the needs for agriculture and other forms of war work that the Board of Education, 12 March, 1915, issued a circular, authorizing the suspension of the by-laws enforcing compulsory attendance; while a few large cities declined to act on this authorization, the number of children under 14 who were employed in some form of work increased from 500,000 to 1,100,000 in three years of the War. Necessary occupation of school buildings for public purposes also had an effect on the normal course of teaching. Among the earliest attempts to counteract juvenile unrest and delinquency was the extension of the Boy Scouts and Girl Brigades, but various committees were soon at work on the whole problem.

school age were equally disquieting. Of those under 14, 35,000 put in only half time at school and 250,000 were casually employed from 10 to 40 hours outside school time. Out of 3,000,000 between 14 and 18, some 2,000,000 received no systematic instruction. In some districts great improvements were effected through the "efforts of enlightened school authorities and medical officers"; in others the central authorities were hampered by obstruction. By the terms of the new Bill, the expenses were divided equally between the central and local governments; all children between 5 and 14 were compelled to attend school and none under 12 were to be employed for wages; children between 12 and 14 could only work outside school hours, but not after 8 P.M. or before 6 A.M. Day continuation schools were provided for all who should leave the regular schools before the age of 16, while, after seven years' time, the age was to be extended to 18; one reason for the delay being the inability to secure at once a sufficient number of trained teachers. Provision was made for better salaries; for nursery schools for children under 6; for special schools for defectives; and for adequate medical inspection, school playgrounds, baths and physical training for all. Moreover, the instruction was not to be vocational in the narrower sense.

The Franchise Act. — One of the most significant reforms during the War period was the Franchise Act of February, 1918. As the result of previous legislation, all male subjects with a fixed abode had secured the vote except domestic servants, and bachelors, lodging with their parents, who paid less than £10 annual rent. Nevertheless, complexities of registration and qualification still existed which excluded many, while the survival of plural voting gave a substantial advantage to property. Moreover, women were still denied the vote. Although, for a decade previous to the War, the militant suffragette group had played into the hands of the conservatives and discredited the cause by their extreme violence, they had the wisdom and patriotism, once the conflict opened, to throw themselves unreservedly into war work. More than a million went into munition factories; but all sorts of occupations, at the front and at home, were filled with busy and effective workers; they served not only as nurses, but as postmen, drivers of omnibuses and coal teams, as policemen, and as agricultural laborers. The Prime Minister recognized their indispensable services with a warm tribute of gratitude, the British Labor party included the enfranchisement of women in their platform; indeed, there was a general turn of the current of public opinion strong enough to include them in the Franchise Act. By the terms of the Act, the right to vote was extended to all men over 21, having a fixed residence

or occupation of business premises for six months; also to all women over 30, hitherto entitled to vote in local elections or the wives of men so entitled.[1] Thus 8,000,000 voters, including 6,000,000 women, were enfranchised, and where 1 in 24 of the population could vote in 1832, now the proportion is 1 in 3. Plural voting was practically done away with, though in a few cases, notably graduates of certain universities, two votes are allowed. The House of Commons was enlarged from 670 to 707, of which number England has 492, Wales 36, Scotland 74, and Ireland 105.

The General Election (December, 1918). — In the autumn of 1918 Mr. Lloyd George appealed to the country on the following main issues: that the Coalition had won the War and deserved to be trusted to deal with the problems of peace to follow; that the Kaiser and others responsible for the War and its accompanying atrocities should be called to account; that Germany should be made to pay for the havoc she had created; that industries essential to national security should be protected; that dumping goods produced by foreign cheap labor should be prevented; that a policy of Colonial preference should be adopted; that the land system should be reformed; that the principle of a minimum wage should be established; that housing and labor conditions should be improved; and that, in the settlement of the Irish question, there should be no coercion of Ulster. The old party lines were practically re-formed, and the main fight was between the Coalition of the former Conservatives (or Unionists as they were generally called) and Liberals on the one hand, and the Labor Party on the other. The final step in ending the party truce, which nominally prevailed during the War, was taken when, by a vote of 2,117,000 to 810,000, the latter definitely withdrew from the Coalition, though eight of their leaders refused to go with them and the head of the Merchant Seamen's League made a ringing appeal to patriotic labor against Bolshevist, defeatist and pacifistic influences. In an election manifesto entitled "Labour's Call to the People," the majority flung "a challenge to reaction"; for the Coalition policy was far from going to the lengths they desired. They demanded a peace of "international coöperation"; declared against secret diplomacy and any form of economic war, and insisted, as an essential part of the Peace Treaty, on an International Labor Charter "incorporated in the very structure of the League of Nations." They warned the Coalition that opposition to the "young democracies of Europe" and intervention on the side of European reaction would be disastrous.

[1] This was a six months' ownership or tenancy of land or premises, lodgers in furnished rooms not included.

They called for immediate withdrawal of the Allied forces from Russia, for freedom for Ireland and India, and the extension to all subject peoples of the right of self-determination within the British Commonwealth of Free Nations. They stood for the destruction of all war-time measures in restraint of civil and individual liberty; the complete abolition of conscription, and the release of all political prisoners. They demanded land nationalization; a substantial and permanent improvement in the housing of the whole people, with at least one million new homes built at the State expense and let at a fair rent. They insisted on a really compulsory Health Act. They stood for free trade, and denounced protective tariffs and attempts to levy burdens on the poor by indirect taxes. In paying the War debt they were for placing the weight "on the broadest backs," by a special tax on capital, *i.e.*, heavy graduated direct taxes, with a raising of the exemption limit. They contemplated an "industrial democracy," with immediate nationalization and democratic control of "vital public services," such as mines, railroads, shipping, armaments, and electric power. Further, they called for the doing away with the menace of unemployment; the recognition of the universal right to work; better pay; the legal limitation of the hours of labor, and drastic amendment of the Acts dealing with factory conditions, safety of the employed, and workingmen's compensation; equal rights and equal pay for both sexes; and the organization of both men and women in one Trade-Union movement. Such was their sweeping program. The two great surprises in the election of December, 1918, were the overwhelming victory of the Coalition over the Labor party, 467 to 63,[1] and the swamping of the Irish Nationalists by the Sinn Feiners, 73 to 5. Very likely the Labor Party is bound to grow stronger; much Government regulation that was fashioned to meet the War emergency has come to stay, more may follow, but whether, in the long run, the liberty-loving Briton is going to tolerate State socialism, with all the restrictions on individual initiative which it involves, is a question as uncertain as it is momentous.

The Irish Problem Again. — The Home Rule Bill which for the third time passed the Commons in May, 1914, was formally placed on the Statute Book following the signature by the King, 17 September, 1914; but successive suspending bills postponed its operation until the conclusion of the War. Moreover, the Ulster minority, which bitterly opposed being included in its provisions, were promised an amending bill by Mr. Asquith, to offset which, John Redmond —

[1] Outside the Coalition, 23 Unionists and 28 Liberals, exclusive of 25 Irish Unionists, were elected.

who actively promoted voluntary recruiting — secured a promise that the Registration and Military Service Acts should not be extended to Ireland. All together, some 170,000 Irishmen volunteered; while small in point of numbers as compared with the other parts of the Empire, especially in view of the fact that nearly half of the recruits were Ulstermen, the Nationalist contingents fought with notable gallantry. But seeds of trouble began to germinate rapidly. Already on the last Sunday in July, 1914 — nine days before Great Britain entered the War — an attempt, on the part of the Irish Nationalist Volunteers, to repeat the Ulsterite gun-running activities of the previous spring resulted in an unfortunate collision with the British troops in which three civilians were killed. German intrigue, backed by Irish extremists in the United States, began to work effectively on a fertile soil. The experience of crises in the past and the strategic importance of the country were well calculated to arouse the gravest apprehension. Ireland in enemy hands, in the event of a war with Germany, offered a serious menace to British security — as a base from which cruisers and submarines could be employed with deadly effect to intercept or destroy sea-going commerce on which Great Britain's very existence depended.

The Elements of Discontent. — As early as 1906, the military correspondent of the *London Times* pointed out the danger of an "exposed coast, a watchful enemy and such smoldering elements of discontent as might always be found to exist in certain parts of Ireland." Chief among these elements was an organization which took the name of Sinn Fein, meaning literally "Ourselves alone," an organization that aimed to cut loose from all connection with England. Founded about 1905 by Mr. Arthur Griffith, it repudiated the parliamentary methods of the Nationalists, and ultimately an extreme group, like the earlier Fenians, set as their goal an Irish republic to be established by direct action.[1] Also there was the Gaelic League, which, although originally established (in 1892) by Dr. Douglas Hyde for the revival of the ancient Irish language and literature, gradually became dominated by Sinn Fein and came to nourish separatist ambitions. A third center of disaffection was to be found among the labor agitators and their followers in Dublin. Their grievances, substantial enough — miserable housing conditions, insufficient wages and frequent unemployment — were largely economic. Not only did they have nothing in common with the Nationalist parliamentary party, whom they regarded as capitalistic in sympathy, but they were not recognized by the orthodox Trade-Unionists because of their radical syndicalistic views. For

[1] The Irish Republican Brotherhood came to comprise the most extreme element.

some years their most effective leader was James Larkin, an uncompromising foe of capital, who organized a formidable transport strike and an armed force known as the Citizen Army, but who subsequently went to America. While wedded to Marxian internationalism which aims at the ultimate ascendancy of labor throughout the world, many of this labor element curiously enough joined forces with Sinn Fein whose primary aims were political and national.

Sir Roger Casement. — By the autumn of 1914 the crisis began to develop and the play of German intrigue on Irish grievances began to bear fruit. An active agent in fomenting strife was Sir Roger Casement, a north of Ireland man and a retired official in the British consular service who had earlier distinguished himself in exposing the rubber scandals in the Belgian Congo and in Putomayo. Already in 1913 he was prominent in the councils of the Irish Nationalist Volunteers; in 1914, before the outbreak of the War, he went to the United States, and, in spite of the fact that he was in receipt of a British pension, identified himself closely with the Clan-na-Gael, the physical force party of the Irish-American Nationalists, and entered into a close working alliance with the German agencies operating in the United States. As early as August, 1914, he began a series of letters to Irish papers protesting against Redmond's recruiting Irishmen for the British army and advocating Ireland's entrance into the War on the German side. In November, 1914, as self-styled "Irish Ambassador," he proceeded to Germany by way of Scandinavia, and, under the ægis of the German Foreign Office, sought to recruit an Irish Brigade from the German prison camps. It should be said, however, that his efforts were usually scornfully repulsed and that he gained few adherents.

The Crisis Draws to a Head. — Meantime, the postponement in putting the Home Rule Bill into force, and resentment against the recruiting campaign of the Nationalist leaders, had resulted, during the autumn of 1914, in a secession of the Sinn Fein extremists from the ranks of the Irish National Volunteers over whom the Redmond influence was strong. The seceders took the name of the Irish Volunteers, and with them the Citizen's Army joined forces in the spring of 1915. Those who remained in the old organization took the name of the National Volunteers. Various causes contributed further to inflame the extremists. War taxes were greatly increased beyond the expenses incurred by Ireland, and there was a cry that the surplus was going into the pockets of the munition manufacturers, though Irish farmers soon began to reap rich profits from soaring prices. Moreover, the arch-enemy of the Nationalists, Sir Edward

Carson, who had once defied the British Government, was taken into the Coalition Cabinet in the spring of 1915; though here it should be said that Redmond might have had a seat had he chosen. There were now four main parties in Ireland: the Unionists, concentrated chiefly in Ulster, but with a sprinkling in the three other provinces, stanchly insistent on the maintenance of the English connection; the old Nationalists, or parliamentary Home Rule party, steadily losing ground; the Sinn Feiners looking toward separation; and the Dublin Labor party which had thrown in its lot with the Sinn Feiners, though the combined forces of the extremists remained in a minority until the summer of 1916. Most disquieting was the fact that each of the four parties was organized into an army. While it must be admitted that the Ulster Volunteers had set the perilous example of creating an army and gun-running in defiance of the law, their action was taken in the interest of maintaining Imperial unity, and, what is more to the point, when Great Britain was threatened by no external danger. German intrigue continued busily, and a still small body of extremists saw in Great Britain's absorption in the furious struggle on the Continent what seemed to them a providential opportunity to strike a decisive blow for Irish independence. The activity of Redmond and other prominent Nationalists in recruiting despite the fact that the prospect of securing Home Rule seemed as far off as ever, the suspicions that Ulster was receiving undue consideration, the grievances of labor and the dreams of a few enthusiasts for a revival of Ireland's ancient glories in language and literature — though no obstacles were put in the way of its teaching in the schools — all contributed to precipitate a crisis. Drilling and arming among opposing factions proceeded unchecked, and lawlessness increased alarmingly. The Government, confronted by a world menace of unparalleled magnitude, took no steps to hasten a settlement which would have to reckon with the resolute opposition of Ulster, while its Irish representative, the Chief Secretary, from undue optimism or lack of decision, hesitated to intervene and put down the bodies of armed men "openly declaring their hostility to the British Government and their readiness to welcome and assist England's enemies." His hesitation was natural, but concession or firm suppression were the only alternatives. For failing to do one or the other the authorities paid the penalty. On the other hand, the Irish missed a great opportunity. To be sure, only the secessionist minority were actually disloyal; but, though it was much to expect, if the great majority had responded more generally and enthusiastically to assist the Allies in defending the cause of civilization they would have won such claim to gratitude that world opinion, to-

gether with the English sense of justice and fair play, would have demanded a speedy settlement of their problem at the close of the War. Thus was the magnificent loyalty of the militants rewarded by the granting of women's suffrage.

The Sinn Fein Rebellion (April, 1916). — While the Government delayed to frame a policy of concession and at the same time regarded it as "safer and more expedient" to leave the law against bearing arms "in abeyance," and while the Royal Irish constabulary vainly sought to keep order, the Sinn Fein and other extremists, financed to considerable degree by Germans and a radical element of Irish Americans,[1] through vehement speaking and an active distribution of propagandist literature contributed considerably to check Redmond's campaign of recruiting, which at first had met with reasonably enthusiastic response. All the while, the Irish Volunteers and the Citizen Army were entering into closer communication with Germany and preparing to revolt. Their plan was to proclaim a general rising throughout Ireland, and, while the British troops quartered in the country were occupied in attempting its suppression, to seize Dublin. To assist the rising, the Germans were to land arms and munitions in Ireland and to send an expedition to attack the east coast of England. Practically all these plans miscarried. Casement, with two companions, was conveyed by submarine to the neighborhood of the Kerry coast, and, in a small boat, effected a landing on Good Friday, 21 April, 1916. Casement and one of his companions, Bailey by name, were promptly discovered and taken into custody. Also, a steamer, with arms and munitions, sent from Wilhelmshaven disguised as a Norwegian trader was intercepted by the British and blown up by its own crew who took to their life boats and surrendered. The contemplated German attack on the English coast amounted to no more than a fleeting and belated raid by swift cruisers after reënforcements of British troops had already been sent to Ireland. The general rising which had been planned to include the whole Irish countryside and timed to take place on Easter Eve (22 April) was prematurely exposed by the capture of Casement, and confined, by prompt and resolute action of the British troops, to a few sporadic though ugly outbreaks and put down within a week.

The attempt to seize Dublin proved to be the most formidable feature of the whole rebellion. Professor John MacNeill, the nominal commander of the Irish Volunteers, disappointed in his expectation that a German contingent of at least 40,000 men would be dispatched

[1] Though the great majority in the United States were extremely loyal to the Allied cause.

to aid the insurgents and discouraged by the news of Casement's arrest, sought to draw back at the last moment, and, late Saturday night, issued an order that there should be "no parades, marches, or other movements" on Easter Sunday. But bolder spirits took the control from his hands, among them James Connolly the commander of the Citizen Army, the Countess Markiewicz, the Irish wife of a Polish nobleman, and Padraic Pearse, the founder and principal of St. Enda's School. An Irish Republic was proclaimed, and Pearse,[1] who announced himself as Commander-in-Chief of the army of the Irish Republic and President of the Provisional Government, boasted that they "had written with fire and steel the most glorious chapter in the history of Ireland." The insurgents seized the general post office and various public buildings and barricaded the streets, and much looting, shooting, and bloodshed followed. The unarmed Dublin police were forced to withdraw, troops were rushed in from neighboring garrisons, by Monday night reënforcements began to arrive from England, on Tuesday martial law was proclaimed; but it was Saturday (29 April) before Pearse and Connolly surrendered, and 1 May before the formal announcement was issued that "all the rebels in Dublin have surrendered and the city is reported to be quiet." Efforts to put down the insurrection without unnecessary destruction of life and property were complicated by the difficulty of distinguishing actual insurgents from the mass of the population,[2] and by various fires due to malice or carelessness, which the firemen were hampered by snipers in extinguishing.[3]

The Bitter Aftermath. — About 1000 prisoners were taken, fully half of whom were sent to detention camps in England.[4] After speedy trials all seven of the signatories to the rebellion manifesto, including Pearse and Connolly, together with seven others who participated in the rebellion, were convicted and shot. Fifty-five more, the Countess Markiewicz among them, were sentenced to death; but the sentence was commuted to life imprisonment or penal servitude for shorter periods. On 15 May, Sir Roger Casement was tried and convicted, in London, for traitorously adhering to the country's enemies

[1] Though he too might not have gone to the extreme limits had he not been pressed by rasher spirits.

[2] There was much looting by the poor and miserable who were not actually insurgents.

[3] One regrettable incident was the fate of Francis Sheehy Skeffington, an adherent of the Irish Republic but a pacifist opposed to violence, who, while attempting to stop looting, was shot by an officer later proved at a court martial to be insane.

[4] Many of the interned were released at Christmas.

beyond the seas in time of open and public war.[1] His execution, and those of the other Sinn Fein leaders as well, were furiously resented by the majority of the Irish people. It should be borne in mind that, while hatred " and distrust of the British connection " was widespread, the rebellion — or, as they chose to put it, the effort to " expel a foreign Power (England) with aid of gallant Allies in Europe (Germany) and exiled children in America " — was the work of a violent and wrong-headed minority. Indeed, the fact that the bulk of the citizens were against the Sinn Feiners materially hastened the collapse of the rising. Redmond denounced the whole enterprise as insane and unpatriotic. Many of the less extreme Nationalist Volunteers loyally supported the Government, regarding an outbreak so ill-timed as an insult to the Irish fighting abroad, while the unexampled prosperity which the farmers were enjoying was no doubt a factor in holding many to their allegiance. The executions and the establishment of military law produced the sudden reversal of opinion; but certainly a combination with " gallant Allies " who were menacing the existence of civilization, and at the very moment that France was being " bled white " from the Verdun drive, deserved exemplary punishment of those responsible for it, and, while the War lasted, military precautions were necessary. A legend grew up that " a few harmless idealists, fighting heroically for their ideal, had been butchered in cold blood by an overwhelming and vindictive army "; but it is largely a legend. Ireland deserves such a settlement as will enable her to realize her best political and economic ambitions; but it should come in spite of the intrigues of Casement and the extremists.

The Convention and Conscription. — As the War progressed, discontent and lawlessness increased in Ireland to an alarming extent; indeed, so bitter was the feeling that even American soldiers and sailors were hooted and pelted by some of the more unruly, apparently, to some extent, because they appeared in uniform as allies of Great Britain. The Home Rule Bill, the putting into operation of which had been so long delayed by the inability of Sir Edward Carson and Redmond to come to terms over the exclusion of the Ulster counties, had ceased to satisfy the great majority, and finally, 16 May, 1917, Mr. Lloyd George sent a letter to the Nationalists and Unionists proposing, as one of two possibilities, a convention of representatives of the various Irish parties and interests to frame a plan of adjustment. This Convention sat from July, 1917, to April, 1918, under the able presidency of Sir Horace Plunkett; but the Sinn

[1] Bailey, who testified against Casement, was acquitted on his plea that he had only accompanied him to escape from a German prison camp.

Feiners, who soon came to call themselves the Irish Republican party, refused to send delegates, on the ground that the Convention was summoned by the British Government and was to consider only a form of "constitution for the future government of Ireland within the Empire," thus excluding any discussion of Ireland's independence. Although the Ulster Unionists sent delegates, they were almost equally uncompromising at the other extreme. The delegates were empowered only to consider proposals, and those who sent them had a pledge from the Government that no settlement would be forced on them without their consent; apparently they were unwilling to go further than Home Rule with the exclusion of Ulster or possibly some form of ultimate federation of the United Kingdom. The Southern Unionists, one wing of the Nationalists, and the Labor representatives were willing to agree on a modified Dominion system which might be adjusted to an eventual federation of the British Isles, while the extremer Nationalists wanted to go to the length of a full Dominion status enjoyed by the Self-governing Dominions beyond the seas, a system which involved complete control of taxes, tariffs and armies, and withdrawal of Irish representatives from the Parliament at Westminster. The majority of the Nationalists were willing to concede at least temporary control of the army, to continue membership in the Parliament of the United Kingdom, and to guarantee free trade with England; the Southern Unionists were willing to allow Irish control of direct taxes, but balked on the question of the customs duties. At that point the Prime Minister intervened, delegates from the Convention held a conference with the Cabinet in February, 1918, as a result of which it agreed that the question of the customs would be postponed until after the War. The Convention came to an end in March, and in April its Report appeared. But the scheme of government which the majority sought was practically still born; for the British Government insisted on imposing conscription as a condition of promising legislation of a nature recommended in the Report.

The Problem. — The situation bristled with difficulties. The Ulsterites could contend that the Nationalists had increased their demands beyond the Home Rule Bill of 1914, while the latter could point to the sudden growth of Sinn Fein, with its demand for an independent republic, and argue that some concession was necessary to meet these increased demands. The majority had favored recruiting and condemned the rebellion; they had failed to get their Home Rule into operation, and now there were few whom it would satisfy, while they were at last threatened with conscription from which they had been promised exemption. The British Government had this justification, that,

in the spring of 1918, the Germans had launched the most formidable drive in their whole terrible series, every available man was needed, the age limit in the rest of the United Kingdom had been raised to fifty, with a provision for going to fifty-six, and there were ominous murmurings in England, Wales, and Scotland against the apparent favor shown to Ireland. Moreover, Protestant progressive Ulster was set against being cast adrift with a majority of Roman Catholic agriculturists, safeguarded only by guarantees in which they had scant confidence. Even a modified Dominion system involved possibilities of control over taxes and commercial policy, to say nothing of religion and military forces, which aroused their gravest apprehensions. On the other hand, aspirations for independence, the legend of the Sinn Fein martyrs, and labor unrest, had drawn the most diverse elements together — including pacifists, conscientious objectors and increasing numbers of the Roman Catholic clergy. This formidable if ill-assorted alliance shattered the Nationalists, and — though conscription was never enforced in Ireland — swept the country in the autumn election of 1918. Meantime, a provisional Republic had been organized, with De Valera — a man of Spanish origin and American birth and a participant in the Rebellion — as President. Refusing to attend the Parliament at Westminster to which they had been elected, the Sinn Fein representatives proceeded to set up an assembly in Dublin, known as the Dail Eireann, which for some months the British allowed to sit undisturbed. All the while, discontent and disorder and terrorism goes on increasing, and the situation clamors for some form of settlement, but what? Out of five possible forms three may be dismissed forthwith. Home Rule apparently is obsolete as a possible solution, so is a federation of the various Self-governing Dominions of the British Empire — Ireland included — and apparently few would go to the lengths of an independent Irish Republic. Many of those who voted for the Sinn Feiners in the last election would no doubt be content with a less radical departure. The choice seems to lie between a modified Dominion system and a federation of the British Isles. It may be necessary to concede the former, though, owing to the closeness of Ireland's situation to England and the conflicting interests of her agricultural and commercial classes, difficulties concerning the army and commercial policy are bound to arise; while the attitude of the Ulster Unionists is a serious obstacle. Could the separatists forget their animosities, a federation with one or more Parliaments for England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales, and one Parliament for matters of common concern would seem to be an experiment decidedly worth trying.

The Dominions in the War. — Counting not only on the split in Ireland but on disaffection in India and Egypt and racial discord in Canada and South Africa, Germany "had hoped to disrupt the British Empire." Conditions seemed favorable for striking vital blows at many points. There was no Imperial Army, and, while small contingents of British troops were quartered in India and Egypt, they were outnumbered by native troops; and, except for South Africa, there had been no British armies in the Self-governing Dominions for years. Even the Crown Colonies were very scantily supplied with British troops; for the Mother Country relied mainly on the fleet for the protection of the Empire. Nor was there any common military policy; since the Committee of Imperial Defense established in 1894 and reorganized in 1904[1] was a purely advisory body. Each Dominion met the problem in its own way. Canada, which had ceased to fear military aggression on the part of the United States and was only remotely apprehensive of far-off Japan, was content with a small militia force, and, owing to political differences, had failed to pass, in 1913, the Borden Naval Bill to build three Dreadnoughts for the Imperial Navy. On the other hand, Australia and New Zealand, lying in an exposed position and fearful of the yellow peril, had recently adopted compulsory military service: the former country had begun to build a fleet, while the latter had presented one ship to the Mother Country. Also South Africa, where the whites were so greatly outnumbered by the blacks, had resorted to compulsory registration to supply a possible lack — which had never occurred — of volunteers for military training. In lieu of constructing ships, the South African Government had contributed annually toward the upkeep of the Imperial Navy.

Thus there were great differences of method and policy in various parts of the Empire, and nothing could be done without the consent of Governments responsible to the people in the various Dominions; moreover, there had been a general desire for a free hand in military policy, lest a common army and navy might involve them in enterprises of which one or another might not approve. Nevertheless, the outbreak of the War fired them with a common purpose and a high resolve to prevent the Empire from being burst asunder. The offers of the Self-governing Dominions to place their lives and their resources at the disposal of the common cause were prompt and spontaneous, while men and money poured in from British colonies and possessions in

[1] It was under the presidency of the British Premier and included various members of the Cabinet, together with naval and military experts, as well as certain high officials from the Dominions who were occasionally called in consultation.

every part of the globe. One Basuto chieftain cried: "Why stand we idle," and the Cayman Islands gave according to their capacity — £210. Truly King George could declare: "I am proud to be able to show to the world that my people overseas are as determined as the people of the United Kingdom to prosecute a just cause to a successful end."

Canada. — The British declaration of war found Canada with a permanent militia — in training all the year — of 270 officers and 2700 men, reënforced by a so-called active militia — in training about two weeks annually — of a nominal strength of 3850 officers and 44,500 men. Straightway the Government offered 20,000 men, at the same time placing her two cruisers at the disposal of the Admiralty for commerce protection. Before instructions could be issued by the military department for the first contingent, 100,000 had volunteered. Foodstuffs and provender, including 1,000,000 bags of flour, were among the earliest contributions. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, leader of the Opposition, gave assurances of support from the Liberal party, and, except for a group of French nationalist extremists, the unanimity was striking. As the Duke of Connaught, then Governor General, announced: "Canada stands united from the Pacific to the Atlantic in her determination to uphold the honor and tradition of our Empire." By the end of September, the first contingent of the Canadian expeditionary force — 31,500 men and 7500 horses — was transported to England, and, after a course of training there, gave a magnificent account of themselves in the Western Campaign of 1915. About 60 per cent were British or Irish born, but it is curious to note that, so late as March, 1916, out of a total of 350,000 volunteers only 16,000 were French Canadians. This aloofness was due partly to anti-English feeling and political opposition to the party in power, partly to religious animosity to France for her anti-clerical legislation a few years previous to the War. Ultimately, however, wise and far-sighted bishops prevailed on zealous and prejudiced priests to cease obstruction on the latter ground. In order to distribute the burden of service effectively and fairly, Sir Robert Borden, in the spring of 1917, came out for conscription. In the election fought on that issue, the Unionist or Coalition Government was victorious and proceeded to the draft. Notwithstanding the fact that the original enthusiasm had gradually spent its force, 448,063 had volunteered by the time the new Parliament had met — 18 March, 1918. Laurier, in spite of his assurances of support at the beginning of the War, opposed the Military Service Act — passed as a result of the Unionist victory — on the ground that to approve it would destroy his influence in Quebec and possibly lead to a revolution of the extremists. As a matter of fact there were

riots in that Province, during the spring of 1918, against enforcing the draft; but they never attained serious dimensions. Food regulation was difficult for many reasons — the great extent of the country and the sparse population in many areas, together with the impatience of control felt by a young self-reliant people. Apparent plenty, suspicion at first that the aim was to reduce the cost of living rather than to save food, as well as the difficulties of distribution in the thinly populated districts helped explain why no rationing system was adopted; but various measures were taken in 1918 to control the food supply — among them licensing of wholesale and retail dealers, and an Order in Council, supplementing existing Provincial legislation, prohibiting the manufacture of intoxicants, in the interest of food economy. All together, Canada[1] like all the Self-governing Dominions[2] made a splendid showing.

Australia. — Formerly, like most folk of English stock, Australians and New Zealanders felt that "compulsory service was a form of slavery unworthy of free Britons." The outcome of the Russo-Japanese War, however, opened their eyes, and, for reasons already stated, led to its adoption. On the outbreak of the Great War this Dominion, too, was swift to demonstrate its loyalty to the Empire. Her army consisted of a citizen force of 50,000 and 85,000 cadets; but, since her Defense Acts made no provision for service abroad, volunteers were necessary, and they were quickly forthcoming. For the first expeditionary force 20,000 were called for; but, by November, 1914, 165,000 were under arms. Before the year was over, Australian and New Zealand forces had assisted in the capture of various German possessions in the Pacific; but the bulk of the Anzacs were sent to Egypt for training. Owing to the free life to which they had been accustomed, they were inclined to be restive under restraint; but at Gallipoli and on the Western front they showed the splendid stuff of which they were made. In spite of the fine spirit manifested by the volunteers, it ultimately became clear to the Government that regular supply of wastage and fairness in distribution of burdens required conscription.[3] Yet, when the issue was referred to the people in a

[1] The total in arms furnished by Canada, including those conscribed, was 640,886 out of a population of not much more than 8,000,000 all told; casualties have been estimated at 205,675, including 55,175 killed. Canada's direct war expenses amounted to about £335,000,000, raised by taxes and loans.

[2] Newfoundland, where the population was only 250,000, very soon had 12,000 volunteers. Finally a legislature which met 23 April, 1918, passed a conscription bill which was signed by the Governor, 11 May.

[3] Following the lead of New Zealand they had already adopted compulsory registration, for all between 17 and 60, in September, 1915.

referendum, it was decisively defeated 28 October, 1916. In May, 1917, a coalition of the Liberals and National Laborites was elected, not on the conscription issue, but with an assurance on the part of the leaders that, in case of necessity, another referendum on the subject would be taken. As a matter of fact, the question was once more referred to the country and was again defeated, largely through the efforts of the extreme labor element of the I. W. W. type, the Sinn Feiners and the conscientious objectors. It is true that the Labor Party have had some legitimate grounds for criticizing the Government; yet, while this may explain, it by no means excuses the obstructive tactics of the extremists while their country was striving to put its full weight in the War. Nevertheless, after all has been said, Australia can be proud of her record.[1]

New Zealand. — When the declaration of war came, New Zealand was just recovering from a syndicalist strike which began in October, 1913, and was only practically broken in February, 1914. Yet she nobly fulfilled her promise that she was "prepared to make any sacrifice to maintain her heritage and her birthright." As early as 10 June, 1916, a bill for compulsory overseas service had been passed, and some 220,000 were recruited, 91,000 of whom were volunteers, and this out of a population of less than 400,000 males over 15 years of age. She lost 56,886 in casualties and expended nearly £80,000,000 for war purposes.

South Africa. — Like Canada, South Africa had to contend with a race problem from which Australia and New Zealand were free. There was a strong Dutch Nationalist element, led by General Hertzog, in Parliament, who complained that the Crown Government discriminated against the Boers in administrative appointments as well as in various other ways, and who, adopting as their motto "South Africa first," vociferously opposed all contributions for Imperial purposes. In spite of their attitude, in spite of unsettled labor conditions, and the fact that the blacks so overwhelmingly outnumbered the whites, General Botha, the Premier, and his Cabinet colleague, General Smuts, at once offered to assume the defense of South Africa, which set free 6,000 regular troops for active service. Here was a great opportunity for malcontents: Hertzog himself was not prepared to go the length of armed revolt; but there were rasher spirits. Chief among them were two veterans of the Boer War — Beyers, a Commander of the Active Citizen Force created by the Defense Act of 1912, and the famous

[1] She raised, paid and equipped an armed force of 416,809 men, she suffered casualties aggregating 209,951, and, up to June, 1918, she had expended — exclusive of £10,000,000 raised for various patriotic funds — nearly £250,000,000.

guerilla leader De Wet. The most sinister figure, however, was Colonel Maritz, who had fought on the Boer side, had later served with the Germans, and who subsequently took a command under Beyers on the South African border.

The South African Rebellion. — Existing elements of discontent were sedulously played upon by German propaganda, and in October, 1914, a revolt of the disaffected broke out which threatened serious consequences. The immediate occasion for the rebellion was an order to invade German Southwest Africa. Many who insisted that they were not pro-German were certainly ignorant or willfully regardless of the German militaristic designs in Africa, and declared that they were averse to mixing in European quarrels in which they had no concern. The signal of revolt was an ultimatum from Maritz who had been in communication with the Germans for weeks. The Government acted promptly, martial law was proclaimed, and, 26 October, Maritz was defeated and forced to flee across the border. Meantime, Beyers had risen in the Transvaal and De Wet in Orange River Free State. The backbone of the rebellion was broken before the end of the month; but the two Boer leaders were not disposed of for some weeks to come. De Wet was finally captured, 1 December, and was later tried and sentenced to six years' imprisonment. Beyers was drowned in attempting to escape after defeat. The last episode in the rebellion was an unsuccessful attempt at invasion from German Southwest Africa, 24 January, 1915.

The Conquest of German Southwest Africa. — Under the personal command of General Botha the conquest of German Southwest Africa was seriously undertaken directly the end of the Boer rebellion was in sight. The territory to be invaded — barren and inaccessible — had been regarded as under British influence until 1882; two years later, following sudden activity of a horde of German missionaries and traders, it was formally annexed by Germany, except Walfisch Bay, the only good harbor on the coast. According to Botha's plan, attacks were made both from the west by sea and by land forces marching across the South African border from the east and southeast. In the final attacks the Premier commanded the sea contingents and his colleague General Smuts the land forces, and, before the close of spring, the conquest was practically complete, though the last German force did not surrender till 9 July, 1915. South Africa was never free from race dissension and nationalistic obstruction throughout the War, yet never again was there serious danger of armed revolt.[1]

German East Africa. — German East Africa, the largest and most

[1] Her contributions for war expenses have amounted to over £60,000,000.

important of Germany's overseas possessions, proved the most difficult to overcome. Here Colonel von Lettow-Vorbeck, who by October, 1914, had an army of 4000 whites and 30,000 natives, more than held his own for a year and a half. The Allied initiative was taken in the autumn of 1914 by an Anglo-Indian force, and the coast was blockaded in the following February. Early in February, 1916, an expeditionary force from South Africa arrived, under General Smuts, who was placed in supreme command. At the time of his arrival the enemy not only held all of German East Africa practically intact but was in possession of a bit of British East Africa as well. The Allies had a difficult problem. In a trying climate, with a very defective system of transportation, they had to maintain long lines of communications and to coördinate forces coöperating at widely separated points — the main force working down from the north, Congo negroes under Belgian officers pushing in from the west, and a Rhodesian contingent starting from the south. Before General Smuts was called to England, January, 1917, he had achieved about two thirds of the conquest, which was only slowly completed by his successors. In November, 1917, Lettow-Vorbeck was driven to take refuge in Portuguese East Africa, whence he subsequently recrossed the border and finally retreated to northern Rhodesia, where he surrendered, 14 November, 1918.

The Other German Possessions. — Meantime, Germany had lost all her other colonial possessions, most of them, indeed, before the close of the first year of the war. In Africa, Togoland was conquered within three weeks, before the close of August, 1914, by Anglo-French and Belgian forces, while the Kamerun fell to the French and Belgians. Both sides used native negroes in the fighting. In the Pacific, Japan played a large part in the conquest of the islands north of the equator, and, November, 1914, took Tsingtau and Kiao-chau in the Chinese Shantung peninsula.

Egypt in the Early Stages of the War. — In spite of the achievements of the British administration in Egypt, there were abundant elements of discord for enemy intrigue to work on. The Turkish Sultan was under German control, and the Khedive, his nominal vassal, who had been educated in Vienna, was in sympathy with the Central Powers; certainly he had been very restive under British advisers, particularly Lord Cromer. There was a group of educated Nationalists who were demanding enlarged powers of self-government; the student body was truculent and dissatisfied; the moneyed class resented the checks on graft and oppression which the British imposed; the lower urban element were poorly off and uneasy, the Bedouins were lawless, while the peasantry, who had profited so greatly under the British régime, were

ignorant and apathetic.[1] On the eve of the War, landlords were hit by the failure to finance the cotton crop, industries were dislocated — with consequent unemployment which gave splendid opportunities for German, Turkish, and Nationalistic agitators; and the Ministry of Finance was slow in rising to the situation. In the interests of the masses and the security of the Empire, the British Government, regardless of the strict letter of the law, took possession. The army of occupation was replaced by detachments from the Indian Expeditionary force, and, in November and December, Anzacs began to arrive. The Khedive, who was in Constantinople when the War broke out, was advised not to return; enemy aliens were registered, and deported or placed in concentration camps; and ships, which refused to leave the Suez Canal, were removed outside the three-mile limit and taken possession of there. Finally, 5 November, 1914, war was declared on Turkey, and 19 December, since the Turks were massing troops in Syria, and since the Khedive was stirring up the Senussi — a reformed Mohammedan sect on the western border — the British proclaimed a protectorate, which was the only alternative to annexation or independence.[2] No military aid was required of the Egyptians.

Turco-German Attacks on Egypt. — It was clear that the Turks, under German direction, would strike an early blow at Egypt; consequently, British ships busily patrolled the coast and the Suez Canal was speedily blocked and fortified. The first Turkish advance, which started in January, 1915, across the Sinai peninsula, was quickly repulsed in February; indeed, the invaders fled so precipitately that few prisoners were taken in the counter-attack which followed. While the enemy were engaged in preparing to try again, Egypt was exposed to danger from a new quarter. The Senussi, whose apprehensions against the territorial advances in northern Africa of the French and the Italians — British allies — had been cleverly worked upon, rose in revolt and, late in 1915, invaded western Egypt, where they were joined by some Bedouin tribes. By the summer of 1916 the British had the situation well in hand, though the Senussi remained a factor to be reckoned with, if not a very serious one. In August, the Turks made their second unsuccessful attack on the Suez Canal.

The Syrian-Palestine Campaign. — After the second repulse of the Turks, the British finally took the offensive, and, during the interval

[1] According to the estimate of an Oriental, rather more than 10 per cent of the population were actively for the British, rather less than 10 per cent opposed, and about 80 per cent were indifferent, so long as they and their religion were left alone.

[2] Hussein Kamil, uncle of the deposed Khedive, was set up as Sultan. He died, October, 1917, and was succeeded by his brother Ahmed Faud.

from December, 1916, to February, 1917, succeeded in clearing the Sinai peninsula of the enemy. The Commander-in-Chief, General Murray, next planned to conquer southern Palestine, but receiving decisive checks, was replaced by General (now Field Marshal) Allenby, who, in October, 1917, opened a strong offensive, broke through the Turkish lines from Gaza to Beersheba, and took Jerusalem, 11 December. Meantime, he had obtained a powerful ally in Hussein, Sherif of Mecca. Hussein, who claimed descent from Mohammed, had in June, 1916, declared himself independent of the Sultan, under whom he had served as Governor and, in November, took the title of King of the Hedjaz — from a strip of country skirting the Red Sea. Coöperating with an Arab army led by one of the sons of the Sherif with whom he advanced in parallel columns, Allenby swept from victory to victory. By the capture of Jericho, 21 February, 1918, he completed the conquest of Southern Palestine. Then, with reënforcements of infantry, cavalry, airplanes and armored cars, he started a final stage of the campaign, 18 September, 1918, and within two weeks had forced the collapse of an army of 110,000 Turks and 15,000 Germans. By 26 October the conquest of Syria was complete. The achievements of Allenby and the army of the King of the Hedjaz, together with the advance of the Allied Balkan army toward the Turkish front near Adrianople, as well as of another British force under General Marshall in Upper Mesopotamia, resulted in the collapse of Turkey, who entered into an armistice, 30 October.

The Mesopotamian Campaign. — The British, who had been established for three centuries in the Persian Gulf, undertook very early in the War, a campaign in Mesopotamia for a combination of strategic, political, and economic reasons; namely, in order to coöperate with the Russians coming down from the Caucasus, to divert the threatened Turkish concentration against Egypt and to guard against a possible menace to India; to block the completion of the German Bagdad railway project;[1] to guard the Persian oil wells and to oust the Turks from the valleys of the Tigris and the Euphrates where they had turned an ancient paradise into a desert. Operating from the Persian Gulf they occupied Basra, 14 November, 1914, whence, by December, they had penetrated fifty miles inland, to the junction of the Tigris and the Euphrates. In April, 1915, General Sir John Nixon was placed in command, and in May, under the immediate command of General Townshend, a fan-shaped drive was launched into Mesopotamia, the cradle of civilization. After a brilliant engagement, one of Townshend's columns captured, 29 September, Kut-el-Amara, a Turkish stronghold

[1] This was a war measure.

on the Tigris. Next, against his better judgment, Townshend was obliged to execute an order to advance to Bagdad. The stakes were the moral effect of capturing the capital of the Khalifs and securing an important base against the Turks; but, with insufficient forces and equipment and a perilous line of communications, it was a hazardous proceeding. On 22 November the invaders were repulsed at Ctesiphon and had to retrreat to Kut where, besieged by a strong force of Turks, Townshend held out for five months, and only surrendered, April, 1916, after three attempts to relieve him had failed. The disaster was rendered all the more deplorable by the woeful defectiveness of the British artillery, transport, and medical supplies, deficiencies so serious that a Royal Commission of investigation was appointed.

THE BRITISH ADVANCE IN ASIATIC TURKEY, 1918.

However, contrary to their policy after the Gallipoli failure, the British persisted. During the summer and autumn of 1916 they reorganized their transport system, and started again, under the effective leadership of General Maude, who, 24 February, 1917, recaptured Kut, and, 11 March, penetrated into Bagdad. The pressure of Allenby's campaign farther west prevented the Turks this time from undertaking a serious counter-attack. Unhappily, General Maude died suddenly of cholera, 19 November, 1917; but the command passed to the competent hands of General Sir William Marshall, while the work of civil administration was ably carried on by Sir Percy Cox. The late General Maude, on the capture of Bagdad, had issued a proclamation expressing sympathy with the national aspirations of the natives, and various efforts were made to gain their confidence, efforts which had at first been hampered by the military reverses of the British,

though the work of the redemption of the country had begun with the occupation of Basra in the autumn of 1914. In the work of winning over the Arabs — many of whom were already anti-Turkish — the British were greatly aided by the new Sultan of Egypt, so long as he lived, and by the King of the Hedjaz, while the process was greatly fostered by the extensive material improvements introduced by the new régime. Railroads were extended, new lines of steamers were started, new irrigation projects were launched, fair rents were adjusted and new markets were set up,[1] and the lawless tribes of the marshes were conciliated. Nevertheless, the whole situation in the Near East is not without very disquieting features. The problem of adjusting the conquered areas of Syria and Palestine to the satisfaction of France and Great Britain, while, at the same time, giving due recognition to the nationalistic aspirations in those territories and in the new kingdom of the Hedjaz, is a complicated and baffling one.[2] Furthermore, the War aims of the Allies, particularly Mr. Wilson's emphasis on democracy and self-determination, the example of Bolshevist Russia, the scarcity and high cost of food, together with the agitation on the part of Nationalists, supported by the unruly city elements and the lawless Bedouins, have led to grave disturbances in Egypt, and in India as well, where many of the same causes have been operative.

India in the War. — India's first reaction to the British declaration of war was one of intense loyalty, greatly to the disappointment of Germany, who had counted on fomenting rebellion there. For the moment, seditious native agitators and German propagandists were inundated in a general wave of enthusiasm for the Allied cause. Numbers of native rulers freely and spontaneously contributed troops, treasure, and private jewels, while not a few volunteered personally to go to the front. Indeed, all sorts of associations, classes, and creeds eagerly offered help. Stocky Gurkha riflemen, Hindus who set little store by caste; tall, clean-cut bearded Sikhs, the backbone of the Indian army; Maráthás; high-caste Brahmans and Rajputs; various Mussulman folk, Punjabi and Pathans from the Northwest Provinces among them, were hurried into action and rendered valiant service on every front. All together, exclusive of 239,561 troops in the Indian army at the outbreak of the hostilities, 1,161,789 were recruited dur-

[1] Bagdad, for instance, was quite transformed by June, 1918, what with a police system, a fire department, schools, and electric lights.

[2] Moreover, a recent agreement between Great Britain and Persia, by which the former guarantees a large loan and undertakes the training of the latter's army and police, has aroused a strong suspicion in many quarters that the British have an eye on the Persian oil fields. Early in 1918 Trotzky announced the repudiation of the Anglo-Russian agreement of 1907 respecting Persia, see above pp. 793, 808.

ing the War, though these huge numbers were only a small proportion of her teeming population of 315,000,000. More striking, considering the poverty of the country, were the generous subscriptions to War loans, her total contribution to the War expenses amounting to over £120,000,000. Thus the effective, honest administration of the British had borne good fruit.

Manifestations of Discontent. — Nevertheless, as the first wave of enthusiasm spent its force, evidences of unrest began to manifest themselves here and there. In a laudable but perhaps mistaken attempt to keep the country contented, Great Britain had failed to call forth India's best efforts, and the ardor of many volunteers was dampened which might have been kept afire by continued sacrifice. The small group of educated malcontents, working hand in hand with German intriguers, began to raise their heads once more. Revolutionary doctrines were persistently preached by well-organized bands of plotters operating from various centers [1] — California, Japan, China, Manila, Siam, Burma, and even Berlin. As a result, there occurred murders and dacoities (organized lootings) in Bengal and the Punjab, and even a few armed risings, of which one that broke out 15 February, 1915, at Singapore created the greatest stir.

The Grievances. — Much of the money alleged to have been "drained" from India has gone to pay the interest on foreign capital necessary to develop the country. Excessive rents have been held in check by Government intervention, and, if unsanitary conditions are all too prevalent and illiteracy is lamentably high, the cost, and the opposition of many of the natives themselves, present formidable obstacles to rapid improvement.[2] Moreover, the transition to industrialism presents new complications. Whatever the cause, misery, poverty, and disease are grim and appalling realities — the cities are congested and masses of operatives are worked long hours and scantily paid; yet, whether conditions can be improved under another system is questionable; for the British officials are honest and generally competent, and strive valiantly to administer a poor country, to introduce western improvements with Oriental revenues. On the other hand

[1] Much capital was made of the discrimination against the coolies in South Africa — which as a matter of fact had called forth protests from the Viceroy, Lord Hardinge — and of the turning back of a shipload of Hindus from British Columbia just before the War. Then agitators like Lajpat Rai have written books in which they pictured, fondly but erroneously, a golden age existing before the British occupation.

[2] Complaints are often heard, too, of the disproportionate expense for military establishments; but the danger, first from Russia and then from Germany, justify what has been done.

they are too prone to hold aloof from the natives and to underestimate the aspirations of the intellectuals, even though the latter do not realize the difficulties of thrusting Home Rule on a vast, inert population, held back by prejudice, ignorance and caste. While it is true that the Indian National Congress and the All India Moslem League have made demands beyond what is practicable, it became clear early in the War that more would have to be conceded in the way of self-government. The Morley-Minto reforms, of 1909, by which two Indians were appointed to the Secretary's Council in England, and one Indian to the Viceroy's Executive Council in India, and by which the natives were given enlarged representation in the Legislative Councils, both central and provincial, had ceased to satisfy. The franchise was on a narrow basis, the elections were indirect; furthermore, the official appointed members outnumbered the elected, who, while they had opportunities for discussion and criticism, had no real power and responsibility. They could carry through nothing which the Government might be pleased to oppose, nor could they stop supplies. Lord Hardinge, who was Viceroy from 1910 to 1916, advocated provincial autonomy and increased devolution of powers from the central Government; but the Secretary of State for India failed to indorse his proposals. As time went on, an advanced section of the "Young" Mohammedans drew closer to the Hindus, in spite of the many points of friction that had hitherto kept them at odds. British support of the French in Tunis and Morocco, of the Italians in Tripoli, the Anglo-Russian agreement, and the pressure on Turkey for reform led the Mohammedans to assume the existence of a growing hostility to those of their faith, suspicions that were diligently fostered by the "Young" Turks and the German. Nevertheless, the land-owning and other conservative elements were soberly distrustful of this alliance, resting on no common ground except opposition to the British régime.

The Demand for Home Rule.—While moderate loyal counsels prevailed in the 1914 session of the Indian National Congress, the radical element had grown decidedly stronger by the following year. Lord Chelmsford, who arrived in India, 4 April, 1916, as Lord Hardinge's successor, was, as events proved, inclined to concession; but the military crisis in Mesopotamia and the need of acting in harmony with the Home Government led him to ignore a project of reform submitted by nineteen "elected" members of the Legislative Council. This gave a handle to the extremists, who captured the Indian National Congress at its Christmas session of 1916, and under the lead of Mrs. Besant, a restless visionary, and Mr. Tilak, a seditious journalist, demanded large powers of self-government. In conjunction with the

All India Moslem League they drafted a scheme calling for control over financial, legislative, and administrative affairs. Further encouraged by the Russian Revolution and the evidence disclosed of the British inefficiency against the Turks in Mesopotamia, they sent a delegation to present their draft to Mr. E. S. Montagu, who had succeeded to the office of Secretary for India[1] in July, 1917. About this time Mrs. Besant and Mohammed Ali, the leading Moslem agitator, were interned for inflammatory utterances. Mrs. Besant, who was subsequently released, was elected President of the Indian National Congress for 1917; Mohammed Ali was chosen to the same office by the Moslem League, a mere demonstration of their attitude as it proved, since, refusing to give requisite assurances, he was held in confinement. Yet, in spite of disorders, of German intrigue, and the vociferousness of the extremists, the majority continued loyally to support the War, and, what with good rains and a fine market for Indian wares, there was a relative degree of prosperity. Very wisely the Government, while determined to put down all sedition and to refuse all impracticable demands, decided to offer a far-reaching concession.

The Montagu-Chelmsford Report. — On 20 August, 1917, the momentous announcement was made in the House of Commons of a definite policy "of the increasing association of Indians in every branch of the administration, and the gradual development of self-governing institutions with a view to the progressive realization of responsible government in India as an integral part of the British Empire." In spite of the distraction of the War, Mr. Montagu went to India, and, with Lord Chelmsford, made an exhaustive investigation lasting six months, the result of which was a report of 300 octavo pages, which was signed by the Secretary and the Viceroy, 22 April, 1918, and shortly afterwards presented to Parliament. "The proposals include a great extension of local self-government, so as to train the extended electorates, a substantial measure of self-government in the Provinces; developments for better representation of Indian needs and desires in the Government of India and an all-India Legislature; machinery for fuller knowledge in Parliament; and means for continuously enlarging, in the light of experience and at regular stages, the element of responsibility to the Indian electorate." In submitting the report, the Government invited reasoned "criticism both in England and in India, official and unofficial alike." It announced that in the place of the old system

[1] Under his predecessor two important steps in advance had been taken. Three members for India, two of them natives, were called to the Imperial War Conference which assembled in March, 1917, and, early in the summer, a third native member was admitted to the Secretary's Council.

of " benevolent despotism (tempered by a remote and only occasionally vigilant democracy in England) " the British Government had " decided on a new policy of marching by successive stages, as fitness develops, to Indian self-government within the Empire." At the same time, it declared its disapproval of the scheme of the National Congress and the Moslem League, which was based on executive responsibility to the Secretary of State and legislative responsibility to the electorate, on the ground that it involved an unworkable authority.[1] In general, the Montagu-Chelmsford plan contemplates, " the eventual

[1] The Report, published 6 July, 1918, grouped its proposals under four main heads. I. With the aim of insuring as much Provincial autonomy as was consistent with efficiency, the Provincial executive was to consist of two Councils: (*a*) the Governor and an Executive Council of two (one European and one Indian) to deal with "reserved subjects," *i.e.* those reserved from legislative control; (*b*) the Governor and one or more members chosen by him from the elected members of the Provincial Council, to hold office during the lifetime of the Legislative Council, and to deal with subjects "transferred" to legislative control. The right of deciding whether a subject was reserved or not was vested in the Governor. The Provincial Legislature was to be elected on a broad franchise and by direct election, except for a few appointed members and some community representatives to protect the rights of minorities. II. In matters of finance the demands of all India should be the first charge; except for this, and for "reserved" subjects, the Legislature would control the Provincial budget. III. The Indian central Government should remain wholly responsible to Parliament; but the Legislative Council was to be enlarged and made more representative "and its opportunities for influencing the Government increased." To this end, the old body was to be made over into two new ones. One, called the Legislative Assembly, was to consist of 100 members, of whom two thirds should be elected, and one third nominated by the Viceroy, of the latter only one third could be officials and another third should represent special interests, European, commercial and land-owning. The other, called the Council of State, was to consist of fifty members — exclusive of the Viceroy — of whom 29 were to be nominated, 21 elected. Each body was to be chosen for five years, though the power to dissolve at any time was lodged in the Viceroy. Moreover, the Council of State was to have final legislative authority in matters which the Government might regard as essential; thus certain matters could be passed in spite of the Assembly. Finally, to the Viceroy's Executive Council one new Indian member was to be added. Two new bodies were set up: an Indian Privy Council for advisory purposes, to which appointments were to be made by the King-Emperor for life; and a Council of Princes, a permanent consultative body to consider questions affecting Native States generally. IV. In proportion as the foregoing changes take effect, the control of Parliament over the Government of India and the Provincial Governments must be relaxed. Meantime, in each session of the House of Commons, a select committee on Indian affairs is to be chosen to give special attention to this important subject. In five years the Government of India is to consider proposals from the Provincial Governments or the Provincial Legislatures for a modification of the list of reserved and transferred subjects, while, in ten years, a committee is to be appointed to re-survey the whole existing system of government. Thus the aim is to attain complete responsibility where possible and as early as possible.

future of India to be a sisterhood of States, self-governing in all matters of purely Provincial interest and presided over by a central Government, increasingly representative of, and responsible to the people of all of them, dealing with matters, both internal and external, of common interest to the whole of India."

The Situation at the Close of the War. — At first, the extremists were inclined to reject these moderate proposals forthwith, while the special interests, European and others, were disquieted that they went as far as they did. Moreover, the triumph of the Allies, who had been professedly fighting for self-determination — though that did not apply to internal arrangements in the countries of their constituent members — the ravages of influenza and other diseases, the scarcity of food, and the general high cost of living have led to serious rioting, further accentuated by the so-called Rowlatt Bills, providing drastic means for suppressing and punishing sedition. However, while the Government aims to hold down anarchy with a strong hand, there are hopeful indications that its reasonable concessions are to be considered on their merits.[1]

The Dominions and Great Britain. — While the Self-governing Dominions for some years have had practically complete control of their internal affairs, even to the extent of controlling their own trade and tariffs, their defense and their immigration, and while — after *laissez-faire* had been followed by a new enthusiasm for Empire — their desire for closer coöperation in matters of common Imperial concern has been partially realized through periodic Conferences, nevertheless, the Government of the United Kingdom, responsible only to the electorate of the British Isles, continued, even so late as the first months of the third year of the War, to regulate the foreign and military policy of the Empire. To be sure, there had been, since 1904, a Committee of Imperial Defense, to which officials from the Dominions had been summoned on occasion, but its functions were solely advisory. There were various reasons why the Self-governing Dominions were, on the whole, content to acquiesce in this continuance of British control.[2] Each had its peculiar problems and did not want to be entangled in European complications, and, at least before the world menace was fully realized, they were reluctant to assume the burden of a great Imperial armament. Yet, when the crisis came,

[1] A Government of India Act based on the Montagu-Chelmsford Report received the Royal assent in December, 1919.

[2] It should not be forgotten, however, that one step in advance had been taken in 1911, when it was announced that henceforth the Dominions would be consulted "automatically" as far as possible in international agreements which affected their interests.

in spite of Prussia's unsubstantial dream of lack of cohesion among the Dominions, one and all took up the struggle in which Great Britain had become involved as their own, and bent their best efforts to maintain the integrity of the Empire. Gradually, however, in consequence of the Gallipoli campaign — in which the Anzacs paid such a heavy toll — and, among other things, in view of the fact that the higher commands, even over the Colonial troops were intrusted to British officers,[1] the feeling grew stronger and stronger that Dominions should have a voice in the conduct of Imperial war policy.[2]

The Imperial War Conference and War Cabinet. — Little by little, the Government began to see the light. In July, 1915, Sir Robert Borden attended a meeting of the Cabinet, and Mr. W. M. Hughes, Premier of Australia, did the like in March, 1916; but the first decisive step came 25 December, 1916, when Mr. Lloyd George invited the Dominion Prime Ministers and other delegates to a special War Conference of the Empire. Of more immediate importance, however, was the fact that the overseas delegates began, almost directly on their arrival, 2 March, 1917, to hold meetings with the British War Cabinet, presumably for the discussion of problems of pressing military and naval importance, though naturally, the deliberations of this Imperial War Cabinet — which came to supersede the Committee of Imperial Defense — have not been disclosed. On 21 March, the Imperial War Conference, for dealing with questions reaching far beyond those of the immediate conduct of the War, was formally opened. Henceforth, the bodies met usually on alternate days. Aside from the nature of the business transacted, the Cabinet and the Conference differed in more than one respect. The former was an executive body and its proceedings were secret, while the latter was an advisory body and its proceedings were published. Moreover, at the Imperial War Conference the Secretary for the Colonies presided, and the Premier and the War Cabinet did not, as a rule, attend. In addition to various officials of the British Government, there were present from overseas, the Premiers from three self-governing Dominions — Canada, Newfoundland, and New Zealand, together with two additional delegates from Canada and one from New Zealand. The Secretary of State for India appeared in behalf of that great dependency, accompanied

[1] Since then, Canadians and Australians have been placed in command of their respective contingents.

[2] A suggestion to this effect was made in 1915, when the next Imperial Conference was due to meet; but the Secretary for the Colonies, who could or would not distinguish between such a special and a normal meeting, waved aside the proposal, on the ground that the British Government was too preoccupied to hold a regular Conference.

by three advisers from India itself, two of them natives. General Botha, the Premier of South Africa, was represented by General Smuts, who, in June, was invited to remain in England as a member of the War Cabinet. Australia, in the throes of a general election, sent no delegates. The result of a series of meetings of the War Conference, concluded 1 May, was embodied in a series of resolutions which recommended that: (1) an Imperial Cabinet should be held every year, consisting of the Premier of the United Kingdom and such of his colleagues as deal specifically with Imperial affairs, of the Premiers of the Dominions, or of some specially accredited alternatives, and of a representative from India; (2) a special conference should be summoned after the War for readjusting the Constitutional relations of the Empire; (3) a principle of reciprocity of treatment of Indians in the Self-governing Dominions should be adopted; (4) the Admiralty work out a scheme of Imperial Naval defense, and special consideration be given to the production of naval and military materials in all parts of the Empire; (5) special encouragement be given to the development of Imperial resources in respect to food supplies, raw materials and essential industries.

In accordance with the first resolution — proposed by the Premier — a second Imperial War Cabinet was held in June, 1918. Thus the Conference of 1917 "created an executive authority for the war purposes of the Empire, while the constitutional issue was in abeyance." Yet, although leaving the definitive settlement to more auspicious times, the Conference went so far as to recommend: "that any such readjustment, while thoroughly preserving all existing powers of self-government and complete control of domestic affairs, should be based upon a full recognition of the Dominions as autonomous nations of an Imperial Commonwealth and of India as an important portion of the same; should recognize their right to an adequate voice in foreign policy and in foreign relations; and should provide effective arrangements for continuous consultations in all important matters of common Imperial concern and for such necessary concerted action, founded on consultation, as the several Governments may determine." While the final settlement awaits adjustment, this resolution indicates in a general way the desires of the Dominions for the future of the British Commonwealth of Nations which they have fought so heroically and devotedly to preserve.[1]

[1] For this cause the Empire, outside the British Isles, furnished nearly £1,000,000,000 for direct war expenditure and about 3,000,000 men, of which the Self-governing Dominions contributed almost £800,000,000 and 1,500,000 men, not far from 25 per cent of their white male population.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

J. A. Fairlie, *British War Administration* (1918). H. L. Gray, *War Time Control of Industry* (1918). F. L. McVey, *The Financial History of Great Britain, 1914–1918* (1918). Joseph R. Smith, *The Influence of the Great War on Shipping* (1918). E. L. Bogart, *Direct and Indirect Costs of the Great World War* (1920). A. F. Pollard, *The Commonwealth at War* (1918). Sir W. Raleigh, *England and the War* (1919). A. Gleason, *Inside the British Isles* (1917). T. W. Wile, *Explaining the Britishers* (1919). Viscount Bryce, *Democracy* (1919).

Labor. Arthur Henderson, *The Aims of Labor* (1918). P. W. Kellogg and Arthur Gleason, *British Labor and the War* (1919). S. G. Hobson, *Guild Principles in Peace and War* (1918). A. R. Orage and S. G. Hobson, *National Guilds* (1918). Sidney and Beatrice Webb, *A History of Trade Unionism* (new ed., 1919). Bertrand Russell, *Proposed Roads to Freedom* (1919).

Biography. "An independent Liberal," *Lloyd George and the War* (1918). Walter Roch, *Mr. Lloyd George and the War* (1920). H. Spender, *The Prime Minister: an Authoritative Biography* (1917).

David Lloyd George, *The Great Crusade* (1918), a collection of speeches during the War. Jan C. Smuts, *War Time Speeches* (1917).

Ireland. Barker, Turner and Hackett as above. In addition to the works in Turner's bibliography the following may be consulted: James Connolly, *Labor in Irish History* (1919); George Creel, *Ireland's Fight for Freedom* (1919); F. P. Jones, *A History of the Sinn Fein Movement and the Irish Rebellion of 1916* (1916); Sir Horace Plunkett, *Ireland in the New Century* (1904); W. B. Wells and N. Marlowe, *A History of the Irish Convention and Sinn Fein* (1919); Rev. Walter McDonald, *Some Questions of Peace and War with Special Reference to Ireland* (1920); Stephen Gwynn, *A History of John Redmond's Last Years* (1919).

For the Dominions and the War and India, see ch. LVII. See also J. C. Hopkins, *Canada at War* (1919); Eleanor Egan, *The War in the Cradle of the World* (1919); Edward Daines, *The British Campaigns in the Nearer East* (1919) and *The British Campaigns in Africa and the Pacific* (1919). The *Round Table* is particularly valuable for war time conditions in the Dominions and throughout the Empire.

The Historical Section of the Committee of Imperial Defense has projected a history of the Great War in all its phases, based on official documents; vol. I, by Sir Julian Corbett, on *Naval Operations* (to the Battle of the Falkland Islands) with accompanying maps, has already appeared.

INDEX

A

Aberdeen, Lord, Foreign Secretary and Premier, 673, 682, 683, 685
Abhorrers, the, 381
Abjuration Act, the, 443
Aboukir Bay, 597
Abraham, the Plains of, 501
Acadia, *see* Nova Scotia
Accession Declaration Act, the, 757
Acre, 81, 597
Adams, John, 540
Adams, John Quincy, 628
Addington, Henry, Lord Sidmouth, 599, 601
Addison, Joseph, 559
Addled Parliament, the, 292
Admiralty, Court of, 708
Admonitions to Parliament, 256
Adrian IV, Pope, 74
Adrian VI, Pope, 197, 198
Adullamites, the, 696
Æthelbert, 22, 23, 31
Æthelfrith, 23
Æthelred, 20
Æthelred, the Redeless, 35, 36
Afghanistan, 673, 786, 787, 792
Africa, British advance in, 774
Africa, German East, 896
Africa, German Southwest, 895–896
Africa, *see* South Africa
African Slave Trade, 578
Agincourt, 165
Agitators, the, 338, 341
Agricola, 13
Agriculture, in the thirteenth century, 109, 110; in the fourteenth, 142; in the fifteenth, 187, 188; in the sixteenth, 270, 271; in the seventeenth, 403, 404, 406; in the eighteenth, 554, 555; in the nineteenth, 616, 635, 741–743; during the World War, 874–875
Ahmed Faud, 897 note
Aidan (ī'dan), 25
Aids, feudal, 59
Aims of Labor, The, 877
Air raids, 834 and note
Aix-la-Chapelle, the peace of, 489, 492
Alabama Claims, the, 710
Alabama, the cruiser, 692
Alaska boundary, the, 766
Albemarle, Duke of, *see* Monck, George
Albert, Prince Consort, 664, 679, 680, 691, 692
Albert Edward, Prince of Wales, *see* Edward VII
Albert, King of the Belgians, 828, 829 note, 852
Alberta, province of, 766
Aldermen, 85, 659
Alehouses, 50, 146, 296, 405
Alexander III, King of Scotland, 113
Alexander of Parma, 254, 257, 259, 260
Alexander I, Tsar of Russia, 599, 602, 606, 612, 626
Alexandra, Queen, 694
Alfred, the Great, King of the West Saxons, 30–32, 50, 51
Algeciras Conference, the, 808
Alien Bill, the, 584
Ali, Mehemet, 629, 780
Allegiance, oaths of, 289, 379, 425, 624
Allenby, General (later Marshal, Viscount), 898, 899
Allotments Acts, 742, 743
Alva, Duke of, 250, 251, 253, 258
Alverstone (awl'verston), Lord, 767
American Civil War, the, 690–692, 698, 702
American Colonies, the, beginnings of, 300, 312; separation of, from Great Britain, 512 ff.
American Revolution, the, causes of, 512–529; chief events in, 529–541
Americans, in the World War, *see* United States
Amherst, General, 503
Amicable Loan, the, 198
Amiens, the peace of, 599
Anesthesia, discovery of, 739
Angevin (an'jevin) dynasty, the, beginning of, 71
Angles, their invasion of Britain, 21
Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, the, 32, 48, 49
Anglo-Saxon period, the, revived interest in the study of, 738
Anglo-Saxons, the, conversion of, 22; manner of living among, 42–51
Aniline dyes, 740
Anjou, 69, 91
Annapolis (Port Royal), 458
Annates, 101; Act of, 208
Anne of Bohemia, Queen of Richard II, 151, 157
Anne of Cleves, 217, 219
Anne of Denmark, 286
Anne, Princess, 396, 431, 435; *see* Anne, Queen of England
Anne, Queen of England, reign of, 443–461
Annual Parliaments, 667
Anselm, Saint, 62, 63, 64
Anti-Corn Law Movement, the, 666, 668, 670
Antiseptic surgery, 739
Antrim, 758
Antwerp, fall of, 838
Anzacs, the, 841, 893
Apology of the Commons, 289
Appeals, Act of, 208
Appellant, *see* Lords Appellant
Apprentices, 409, 411, 706; statute of, 274
Appropriation of supply, 299, 370, 426
Arabi, revolt of, 781
Arbitration, 710, 767
Arbuthnot, John, 442
Architecture, Anglo-Saxon and Norman, 49; Anglo-Norman, 61; in the thirteenth century, 107; in the fourteenth century, 146, 147; Elizabethan, 276, 277; in the seventeenth century, 420
Arc lights, 740
Area, the, of the British Empire, 761
Areopagitica, the, 418, 437
Argyle, *see* Campbell
Arimathea, Joseph of, 15
Arkwright, Richard, 550
Arles, Synod of, 15
Armada, the Spanish, 259–261
Armagh (ar'mah'), Archbishop of, 380; county of, 758
Armed neutrality, 535, 598
Argonne Forest, 851, 852, 853

Armenian massacres, 818
Armistice, in the World War, 852–854
Arms, Assize of, 78
Army, the parliamentary and royal, in the Civil War, 329, 330; struggle with Parliament, 338–340; under Charles I, 362; reforms in 1904, 754; crisis in Ulster, 759, 760, *see also* New Model *and* Standing Army
Army Act, the, 424
Army Council, of the New Model, 338; of 1904, 754
Army officers' commissions, 707
Army plots, the, 322, 323, 324
Arnold, Matthew, 732
Arras, battle of, 848
Art, Anglo-Saxon, 49; seventeenth century, 420; Victorian, 743; *see also* Painting
Art of Colonization, the, 763
Artevelde, van, Jacques, 128
Arthur, legendary, British king, 61, 129, 148, 192
Arthur, Prince, nephew of John, 89, 90
Arthur, Prince, son of Henry VII, 186, 203
Articles of Faith, the Ten, 213; the Six, 216, 219; the Forty-two, 234; the Thirty-nine, 249, 729
Aryan "race," 9
Ascham (as'kam) Roger, 227, 228, 278
Ashbourne Act, 715
Ashburton boundary treaty, 675
Ashley, Lord, 656, 657, 670, *see* Cooper
Aske, Robert, 214
Asiento, 459, 478
Asquith, Herbert Henry, Prime Minister, 755, 756, 757, 759; assumes the Secretaryship of War, 760; declaration regarding Balkan states, 821; states British War aims, 834–835; his policy, 865; admits Conservatives to Cabinet, 867; resignation of, 867–868
Assandun, 37
Assize, meaning, 77; Courts, 268; the Bloody, 387
Assize of Arms, 78
Assuan dam, 784
Astrology, 277
Atheists admitted to Parliament, 712
Athelstan, King, 33
Atlantic cable, 740
Atlantic fisheries, 767
Attainder, Bills of, against More and Fisher, 209; against Thomas Cromwell, 217; against Thomas Seymour, 233; against Strafford, 322; against Fenwick, 434; against Bolingbroke, 465
Audit of Accounts, 134, 163, 370, 576
Auerstädt, battle of, 602
Augusta, Princess, 507, 508
Augustine, 23
Austen, Jane, 639
Australia, 682, 768–771; military system of, 891; in the World War, 856, 893–894
Austria, in the Seven Years' War, 495, 496, 503, 504; in the French Revolution, 583–585; in the French and Napoleonic wars, 588, 589, 591, 592, 597, 598, 601, 605, 607; in Italy and Quadruple Alliances, 612, 613; aids in suppressing revolutions, 626, 627; in relation to Crimean War, 684, 686; and the War for Italian unity, 688–689; in the Danish War, 693, 694; defeated by Prussia, 700; in the League of the Three Emperors, 800; in the Russo-Turkish War, 801–804; in the Triple Alliance, 804; seizes Bosnia and Herzegovina, 820; in the Balkan War settlement, 822–823; demands of, on Serbia in 1914, 824–827; in the campaign of 1914, 839; in 1915, 839–840, 843; in 1916, 846; surrender of, 843
Austrian Succession, the War of, 480, 482–484, 489, 490
Austro-Prussian War, 700
Avice, *see* Isabel
Avignon, 150
Avranches, 75

B

Babington's plot, 259
Bacon, Francis, 279, 296, 297, 416, 737
Bacon, Roger, 106, 107
Baden-Powell (bay'den po'ell), Colonel, 778
Bagdad, 899–900; railway, 819, 820 and note, 898
Bakewell, Robert, 555
Balaclava Bay, 685
Balfe, Michael, 744
Balfour, Arthur, Irish Secretary, 717; Prime Minister, 753–755
Balkan Wars, 821, 822
Ball, John, 154, 155
Balliol, Edward, King of Scotland, 126
Balliol, John, King of Scotland, 113
Balliol College, 106
Bank of England, 436, 437, 590
Bank Charter Act, 669
Bannockburn, 122
Barber Surgeons, 146
Barbon, Nicholas, 416
Barebones Parliament, 349
Baring, Evelyn, Lord Cromer, 782–784, 896
Barnet, battle, of, 177
Barons, conflicts with John, 93–97; with Henry III, 100–103; with Edward II, 121, 122
Barrier treaty, 459
Barrows, 9, 11
Batavian Republic, 589
Bate case, 290
Bath, health resort, 412
Batta, 785
Battle, trial by, 78
Bayeux Tapestry, 41
Beachy Head, battle of, 427
Beaton, Cardinal, 232, 241, 242
Beatty (bē'ty), Admiral Sir (later Lord David), 858, 863
Beaufort (bō'fort) Edmund, Duke of Somerset, 170, 171, 172
Beaufort, Cardinal Henry, 170
Becket, St. Thomas, 72–74, 145, 149, 215
Bedchamber question, 663, 664
Bede, the Venerable, 26, 48
Bedford, Dukes of, *see* John and Russell
Belfast, 6, 758
Belgæ, 10
Belgium, 630, 631, 823; British support of, against German violation, 827–830, 834; in the campaign of 1914, 835–839; in the campaign of 1918, 850, 852; in the Armistice, 854; *see* Ostend and Zeebrugge
Belgrade, bombarded, 825–826
Bell, Andrew, 706
Bell, Henry, 634
Belleau Wood, 851
Bellerophon, the, 612
Benares, the Rájá of, 572
Benedictine Order, 26
Benefit of Clergy, 75
Benevolences, 180, 267, 292, 306
Bengal, 502, 503, 571, 788
Bentham, Jeremy, 636, 645, 646
Bentinck, Lord George, protectionist leader, 672
Bentinck, William, Duke of Portland, 570
Bentinck, Lord William, reforms in India, 785
Bentley, Richard, 556
Benzene, 740
Beowulf, 48
Berchtold, Count, 826

Berkeley (bark'ly), George, 557
Berlin, Congress of, 803
Berlin Decree, 602, 603
Bernhardi, General von, 816
Bernicians, 21
Berwick (ber'ik), Duke of, 534
Besant (Be-sant'), Mrs., 902, 903
Bethmann-Hollweg, Von, 814, 827–829, 861
Beyers, General, 894–895
Bible, translations, 151, 152, 216, 288; views of Puritans on, 303
Bill of Rights, 381, 425
Bishops, method of appointing, 55, 64; character of, in early nineteenth century, 727
Bishops' War, first and second, 315, 317
Bismarck, his policy, 693, 700, 709, 710, 800–803, 817; his death, 723; his social insurance, 746; his fall, 804, 805
Black Death, 129–131, 142, 146, 153, 187
Blackmore, Richard, 737
Black Mountains, 5
Black Prince, *see* Edward
Black Sea, 629, 684; neutralization of, 686; Russian ships again admitted in, 710
"Black Year," 742
Blake, Admiral, 347, 352
Blenheim, 449, 450
Blockades, 535, 599, 603, 687; *see* Navy, British, *and* Submarine Warfare
Blockade running, 691
Bloemfontein (blōm'fontīn), 777, 779
Bloody Assize, 387
Bloody Clavers, *see* Graham, John
Blücher, Marshal, 611, 612
Blue Coat School, 255
"Blue Stockings," 568
Boadicea or Boudicca, 13
Board schools, 706, 707
Boccaccio, 149, 200
Boer War, 775–778
Boleyn (bul'len), Anne, 203, 208, 212
Bolingbroke, *see* Henry of Lancaster *and* St. John, Henry
Bologna, University of, 77
Bolshevists, 849, 850, 881
Bonaparte, Joseph, King of Spain, 603, 604
Bonaparte, Napoleon, at Toulon, 588; defeats Austrians, 590; in Egypt, 592, 597; First Consul, 598; designs in 1803, 600; crushes Third Coalition, 601; victories at Jena and Auerstädt and agreement with Alexander I, 602; his Continental System, 602, 603; rising in Spain against, 603, 604; victory at Wagram, 605; Russian Campaign, 606, 607; first abdication, 608; escape from Elba, 610; Waterloo and final overthrow, 611–612; buys English goods, 633–634; canal project, 780
Bonar (bon'ner) Law, Andrew, 759, 868
Boniface VIII, Pope, 116
Bonner, Edmund, Bishop of London, 231, 239
Book of Rates, 290
Books of Beauty, 730
Borden, Sir Robert, 891, 892, 906
Boroughs, origin and characteristics, 43, 44; after the Conquest, 60; in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, 85; under the Tudors, 266; at the eve of the first Reform Bill, 648, 649; franchise in, under the Reform Acts of 1832 and 1867, 683, 699; under the Municipal Reform Act of 1835, 659
Bosnia, 801, 802, 820
Boston, massacre, 526; "Tea Party," 527; Port Bill, 528; siege of, 531
Boswell, James, 561
Bosworth, battle of, 180, 181
Bot, 44
Botha (bō'ta) General, 777, 779, 894–895, 907
Bothwell, *see* Hepburn, James
Boulogne (booloin'), 601
Boulton (bol'ton), Matthew, 522, 553
Bourbon, Isle de, 493
Bourbons, the, 608, 630
Boxer Rebellion, 807
Boxley, the rood of, 215
"Boy Patriots," the, 480
Boy scouts, 778, 879 note
Boyle, Robert, 416
Boyne, battle of the, 427
Brachycephalic skulls, 9
Braddock's defeat, 404
Bradlaugh (brad'law) case, 712
Braganza, House of, 603
Brahmans, 788, 794
Brandywine, 532
Brass money, abominable project of, 317
Brazil, 627
Breda, Declaration of, 357, 361–363; peace of, 368
Brest, 432
Brest-Litovsk, treaty of, 850, 854
Bretigny, peace of, 132, 133
Bribery, in Parliament, 472, 650, 651; in elections, 649
Bridewell, 235
Bridgewater canal, 551
Bright, John, 668, 698, 699, 716, 717
"Bright Clauses," 705
Brindley, James, 551
Bristol, 4, 652
Britain, races in, 8 ff.; extinct men and animals of, 8, 9; paleolithic and neolithic age in, *ib.*; Celtic invaders in, 9 ff.; Roman occupation of, 12–18
British and Foreign School Society, 706
British Columbia, 766
British East African Co., 774
British Empire, 761–763, 795–797; Dominions of, in the World War, 891 ff.; present problems, 905–908; *see* Australia, Canada, South Africa, New Zealand, Egypt *and* India
British Isles, physical characteristics of, 1–7
Broad Bottom Ministry, 742
Broad churchmen, 729
Brontë, Charlotte, 735
Bronze age, in Britain, 10
Brougham, Henry, Lord, 640
Browne, Sir Thomas, 417
Brownists, the, 255
Browning, Elizabeth Barrett, 733
Browning, Robert, 733
Bruce, David, King of Scotland, 126
Bruce, Robert, claimant to Scottish throne, 113
Bruce, Robert, King of Scotland, 117, 122, 126
Brunnanburh, 33
Brussels, 611, 630
Brut, Layamon's, 84
Brythons, the, 10
Bucharest, treaties of, 822, 850, 854
Buckingham, dukes of, *see* Villiers
Buckle, Thomas, 737
Budgets, Peel's, 668, 669; Gladstone's, 682, 689, 690; Mr. Lloyd George's, 755
Bulgaria, 801–804, 820–822, 843, 846, 847, 853
Bull, *see* John Bull
Bull baiting, 642
Buller, General, 777
Bunker Hill, battle of, 531
Bunyan, John, 417
Burgh, de, *see* Hubert
Burghley (bur'ly), Lord, *see* Cecil, William
Burgoyne, General, 532, 533
Burgundy, 178

Burgundy, dukes of, *see* John, Philip *and* Charles, *see also* Margaret *and* Mary
Burh, *see* borough
Burke, Edmund, views on American taxation, 515; character and policy, 519, 520; conciliation plans, 529; work on India Bill, 572; in trial of Hastings, 579; attitude toward French Revolution, 581, 582, 585, 586
Burke, Thomas Henry, 714
Burne-Jones, Edward, 744
Burney, Fanny, 563
Burns, Robert, 636
Burton, Robert, 417
Bury St. Edmunds, 93
Bushel's case, 437
Bute, Earl of, *see* Stuart, John
Butler, James, twelfth Earl and first Duke of Ormonde, 335, 336, 345
Butler, James, second Duke of Ormande, 458
Butler, Samuel, 418
Butt, Isaac, 712
Byng (bing), Admiral George, Viscount Torrington, 427
Byng, Admiral John, 495, 498
Byng, General, 853
Byron, Lord, 637, 638, 732

C

Cabal Ministry, 372–375
Cabinet system, beginning of, 359, 438, 439, 543–545; weakness of, under Anne, 454; checked by George III, 506; becomes a reality, 604; changes in, during World War, 866–868, 906–907
Cable, the Atlantic, 740
Cabot, John, 186, 191, 200, 272
Cade's rebellion, 171
Cadiz, expeditions against, 262, 304
Cædmon, 48
Cæsar, Julius, his *Commentaries*, 10, 18; his invasions of Britain, 12
Calais, made a staple, 139; capture of, 128, 129; use of cannon at, 144; retained in 1453, 172; lost by English, 240, 245
Calcutta, 402, 493, 502
Caleb Williams, 639
Caledonians, 11
Calendar, reform of, 491
Calvinism, 231, 241, 242
Cambrai, 849
Cambrian mountains, 5
Cambridge, University of, 84, 227, 746
Cambridge Platonists, 413, 414
Camden, Earl, *see* Pratt, Charles
Campbell, Archibald, Eighth Earl, and Marquis of Argyle, 346, 386
Campbell, Archibald, ninth Earl of Argyle, 386
Campbell, Archibald, Marquis and first Duke of Argyle, 429
Campbell, John, second Duke of Argyle, 465, 466
Campbell, Sir Colin (later Lord Clyde), 790
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir Henry, 754, 755
Campeggio, Cardinal, 294
Camperdown, 591, 592
Campion, Edmund, 255
Campo Formio, peace of, 591, 592
Camulodunum, 13
Canada, British conquest of, 501, 503; cession of, to British, 509; effect of cession, 514, 515; Quebec Act for government of, 528; in War of 1812, subsequent history of, 763–767; in World War, 891–893
Canal transportation, 551
Canning, George, Foreign Secretary and Leader of the Commons, 620; Ministry of, 622, 623; foreign policy of, 627–629; joins in founding the *Quarterly Review*, 640
Canning, Viscount, 788, 789, 791
Cannon, first use of, 144
Canon law, 77
Canterbury, founding of Archbishopric of, 23; disputed election, 91
Canterbury Tales, 149
Canton, 674
Cape Breton, 509; *see also* Louisburg
Cape Colony, 772
Cape of Good Hope, 272, 599, 612
Cape St. Vincent, battle of, 590, 591
Capitalist class, rise of, in England, 533
Caporetto, 849
Caracalla, decree of, 14
Card playing, 567, 568
Cardinal's College (later Christ Church), 196
Carlyle, Thomas, 731, 732
Carmarthen, Marquis of, *see* Osborne, Sir Thomas
Carnarvon, 112, 121
Carnatic, the, 493, 503
Carnot, 588
Caroline of Anspach, Queen of George II, 475, 476
Caroline of Brunswick, Queen of George IV, 619, 620
Carpenter, Captain, 862
Carr, Robert, successively Viscount Rochester and Earl of Somerset, 294
Carson, Sir Edward, 757, 758, 884, 885
Cartagena, 480, 481
Carthusians, the, 210
Cartwright, Edmund, 550
Casement, Sir Roger, 884, 886, 887, 888
Castles, Anglo-Norman, 61; in the thirteenth century, 107; in the fourteenth century, 146, 147
Castlereagh (castleray'), Viscount, later Marquis of Londonderry, in Ireland, 595, 596; Secretary for War, 604; at Congress of Vienna, 610; death and estimate of, 620; foreign policy of, 626, 627
Catesby, Robert, 288, 289
Catharine of Aragon, Queen of Henry VIII, 186, 198, 202–204, 208, 210
Catharine of Braganza, Queen of Charles II, 366, 379, 380
Catharine Howard, Queen of Henry VIII, 219
Catharine Parr, Queen of Henry VIII, 219
Catharine de' Medici, 253
Catharine II, Empress of Russia, 535
Catholic Emancipation, 624–626
Catholic League, the, of 1609, 295
Catholics, *see* Roman Catholic
Cattle Act, Irish, 363
"Cautionary towns," the, 257
Cavalier Parliament, temper and work of, 363, 364; beginning of bribery in, 376, 377; dissolution of, 380
Cavalier ports, 417
Cavaliers, 325, 353
Cavendish, Lord Frederic, 714
Cavendish, Henry, 735
Cavour, Count, 688, 689
Cawnpore, 789
Caxton, William, 192
Ceawlin, 21
Cecil, Robert, successively Viscount Cranborne, and Marquis of Salisbury, his first Ministry, 715, 716; his second Ministry, 720; third and last Ministry, 723–725; retirement and death, 753; his foreign policy, 799; his negotiations in the Russo-Turkish War, 801–802; his famous declaration, 818, 819
Cecil, William, Lord Burghley,

successively Secretary of State and Lord Treasurer, 244, 261, 274
Celts, the, 9–12, 18, 21–22
Censorship, *see* Press
Ceorls, 47
Cerdic and Cynric, 21
Ceylon, 599, 612
Chaise, Père la, 378
Chalgrove Field, 332
Chalmers (chäh'mers) Dr., 730
Chamberlain, Joseph, enters Cabinet as Colonial Secretary, 723; advocates tariff reform, 753; relations with South Africa, 775, 776
Champagne, the, drive, 844
Chancellor, the Lord High, 65, 72, 100, 132, 267, 625
Chancellor, Richard, 271
Chancery, court of, 708
Channel ports, the, 838, 839, 850
Chantries, 227, 231, 235
Chapman, George, 278
Charles, Prince, 294, 298, 299; *see* Charles I
Charles I, King of England, character and problems, 301, 302; his advisers, 303; his first Parliament, 303; dissolves his second, 304; his financial exactions, 304, 305; war with France, 305; signs Petition of Right, 306; attempts to collect tonnage and poundage, 307; dissolves third Parliament, 308; his eleven years of personal government, 308–316; summons Short Parliament, 316, 317; further devices for raising money, 317; summons Great Council and another Parliament, 317; consents to Strafford's execution, 322; journey to Scotland, 324; rejects the Grand Remonstrance, 325; attempts to arrest the five members, 325, 326; withdraws from London and sets up standard at Nottingham, 326; as commander of the royal forces, 329–335; flight after Naseby, 335; intrigues with the Irish, 335, 336; surrender to the Scots, 336; handed over to Parliament, 337; seized by the Army, 338; his "Engagement" with the Scots, 340; his trial and execution, 341, 342; regulation of trade and manufactures, 401; as an art collector, 420
Charles II, King of England, proclaimed in Ireland and Scotland, 345, 346; flight after Worcester, 347; results of his French policy, 352; recall to England and Declaration of Breda, 357; character and policy, 360; his revenue, 362; failure to secure toleration, 362–366, 374; foreign policy and marriage, 366; second war with the Dutch, 366–368; throws over Clarendon, 368, 369; seeks to make himself absolute, 372; negotiates secret treaty of Dover, 373–374; third war with the Dutch, 374, 375; turning point in his policy, 375, 376; his tortuous foreign policy, 377; attitude toward the Popish Plot, 377–380; vain effort to save Danby, 380, 381; his triumph over the Whigs, 381–383; his death, 383; compared with James II, 385; beginning of bribery under, 649
Charles Edward, the Young Pretender, 484–487
Charleston, siege, of, 531
Charter, confirmation of, 103, 116, 117
Charter, the Great, *see* Magna Carta
Charter of Liberties of Henry I, 63, 64, 93
Charterhouse, the, 210
Chartism, 667–668, 678
Château-Thierry, 851, 853
Chatham, Earl of, *see* Pitt
Chatterton, Thomas, 564
Chaucer, Geoffrey, 149, 192, 200, 277
Chelmsford, Lord, 902, 903
Chester, 23, 54
Chester castle, 703
Chesterfield, Earl of, *see* Stanhope, Philip Dormer
Chevalier de St. Georges, *see* James Francis Edward
Chichester, Sir Arthur, 291
Child, Sir Josiah, 415
Child labor, 656, 657, 670
Children in the Middle Ages, 143
China, opium war with, 673, 674; war with, in 1856, 787, 789; *see* Boxer Rebellion, Kiao-Chau, *and* Manchuria
Chinese coolies, 754
Chivalry, 144
Christ Church, *see* Cardinal's College
Christian IX, King of Denmark, 693, 694
Christianity, British, 15; conversion of Anglo-Saxons to, 23
Christian Socialism, 749
Christmas, Old Father, 148
Christ's Hospital, 235
Chroniclers, *see* William of Malmesbury, Geoffrey of Monmouth, William of Newborough, Matthew Paris, Froissart
Church, the English, beginnings of, 23, 24, 25; organization and extension of, 25; influence of, 26, 27, 29; attitude of William I to, 54, 55; struggle of William II against, 62, 63; concessions of Henry I to, 63, 64; gains of, under Stephen, 70; conflicts of Henry II with, 72–74; secular character of, under Henry II, 82, 83; concessions to, in Magna Carta, 95; condition of, under Henry III, 99, 105, 106; Statute of Mortmain against, 119; declining power of, in the fifteenth century, 183, 184; see Church of England, Church of Rome, Reformation, Oxford Movement, Anselm, Becket, Wiclif, Laud, Wesley
Church, the Scotch Irish, 15, 24, 25
Church of England, separation from Rome, 207–210; suppression of the monasteries, 211–212, 214–216; articles of faith under Henry VIII, 213, 216, 217; Protestant excesses, 231; Acts of Uniformity and the Forty-two Articles, 231–232, 234; counter-Reformation under Mary, 237–240; the Elizabethan, 245, 246, 248–250, 254–257, 265–266; policy of James I toward, 287, 288, 289; parties in, under Charles I, 301, 303; Declaration of Charles I, 307; Laudian policy, 509–313; split over reforms of, 323; attitude of Cromwell toward, 350, 351; ceases to be a national body, 357; failure to secure toleration in, under Charles II, 362, 364–366, 374–376; aims of James II to, 385, 386, 388–390, 392–394; the clergy of, in the seventeenth century, 407; Latitudinarian movement in, 413, 414; toleration granted, 424, 425; establishment guaranteed in Union, 453; Sacheverell's defense of, 455, 456; rationalism in, in the eighteenth century, 556; reforms in, under William IV, 660; disestablished in Ireland, 703, 704; control of, in education,

705–707; condition of, in the nineteenth century, 727–729
Church of Rome, introduced into Kent, 23; triumph of, at Whitby, 25; organization and extension of, 25, 26; English fear of, in 1850, 678–679
Church of Scotland, *see* Scotland
Church courts, from William I to Henry II, 72–73; under Elizabeth, 265, 266
Church, rates, compulsory, abolished, 660
Churchill, John, later Earl and Duke of Marlborough, deserts James II, 396; dismissed by William III, 431; betrays expedition to Brest, 432; takes up William's work, 443; character of and relations to parties, 447–448; his campaigns, 448–451, 453–455, 457; granted Blenheim, 450; his removal and achievements, 457–459; retires temporarily to Continent, 460; mention of, 490
Churchill, Lord Randolph, 716
Churchill, Winston, 814, 841, 867
Cibber, Colley, 565
Cinque (sink) Ports, 108, 139
Circulation of the blood, *see* Harvey
Cistercians, 67
Cities, 44; *see* Boroughs
Citizen Army, Irish, 884, 887
Civil List, of William III, 425, of Victoria, 662, 663; of Edward VII, 753
Civil service, 682, 707, 792
Civil War, the American, 690–692
Civil War, the Great, 327–336; the second, 340–341
Clan-na-Gael, 884
Clarence, Duke of, *see* George
Clarendon Code, 364–366
Clarendon, Constitutions of, 73
Clarendon, Earl of, *see* Edward, *and* Villiers, George
Classes, Presbyterian, 241
Classicism, revolt against, 564
Claudius, Roman Emperor, 12
Claverhouse (clāvers) *see* Graham, John
Clayton-Bulwer treaty, 768
Clement VII, Pope, 198, 204, 207
Clergy, condition of, in the tenth century, 35; in the thirteenth century, 105, 106; in the seventeenth century, 407; in the eighteenth century, 556; in the nineteenth century, 727–728; *see also* Church
Clergy reserves, 764, 765
Clericis Laicos, 116
Clerkenwell, 703
Clermont, the, 634
Clinton, General, 534–536
Clive, Robert, later Baron Clive, 493, 502–503, 571, 785
Closetings, the, of James II, 392
Clubs, London, 452
Cluniac reforms, 35
Clyde River, 3, 6
Cnut, King of England, 36–38
Coal, 401, 551; strike, 757; German and Biritish production of, 810; British supply to Allies, 855; wartime control of, 870
Coalition, against France, first, 587–592; second, 597, 598; third, 601–602; Ministries, 498 ff., 682–685, 866 ff., 881, 882
"Coat and conduct" money, 317
Cobbett, William, 617, 618
Cobden, Richard, 668
Cobham, Eleanor, Duchess of Gloucester, 170
Cockfighting, 642
Codrington, Admiral, 629
Coercion Bills, for Ireland, 655, 656, 673, 677, 713, 718, *see also* Ireland
Coffeehouses, 411, 412
Coinage, British, 11; under the Edwards, 139; debasement of, 224; restoration of, under Elizabeth and William III, 270, 434, 435; *see* Brass money
Coke, Sir Edward, 293, 306
Cole, Old King, 148
Coleman, Edward, 378, 380
Coleridge, Samuel Taylor, 636, 637
Colet, John, 200, 226
Coligny, Admiral, 253
Colley, Sir George, 773
Collier (colyer), Jeremy, 420
Collins, Wilkie, 736
Colonial conferences, 796, 906–908
Colonial preferences, 753
Colonies, *see* American Colonies
Colonies, British, Huskisson's policy regarding, 621; abolition of slavery in, 656, 663, 772; Durham's *Report* on, 772; Disraeli's Imperialistic views concerning, 701, 799; England's growing interest in, 662, 719, 762; effect of inventions on, 740, 741; system of government of, 761, 762, 905–908; in the World War, 891–908; *see* Australia, Canada, New Zealand, South Africa, Empire, Imperialism
Colonies, German, 774, 805, 807, 856
Colonies, Portuguese, 627, 774
Colonies, *see also under* Dutch, France, Germany, Portugal, Spain
Columba, Saint, 25
Columbia River, 675
Columbus, Christopher, 200
Comet, the, 634
Comites, 20
Commander-in-Chief, of the British Army, office of, 686, 754
Commerce, *see* Trade
Commercial treaties, *see* Burgundy, France, Ireland, *and Intercursus Magnus*
Commissioner, Lord High, *see* Durham
Committee of Both Kingdoms, 329, 334
Committee of Imperial Defense, *see* Imperial Defense
Committee of Safety, the, in the Civil War, 329
Common Law, the, 77
Common law courts, *see* Courts
Common Prayer, Book of, 216, 231, 232; revisions of, 234, 245, 364
Common Sense, Paine's, 531
Commons, House of, first separate session of, 115; initiative in legislation, 137; money grants originate in, 163; composition of, under Henry VIII, 222, 223; Roman Catholics excluded, 249; Elizabeth's control of, 266; privileges gained under James I, 289, 290, 297–299, 330; gains in appropriation of supply, audit of accounts, and recognition of sole right to initiate money grants, 370; struggle over exclusion of Wilkes, 510–512, 522; theory and practice of representation in, 512, 513; Grenville Act relating to disputed elections and struggle over reporting debates in, 525, 526; contractors excluded from, 537; condition of, on eve of first Reform Bill, 647–651; reform of, by Bill of 1832, 653; by Bill of 1867, 699–700; by Bill of 1885, 714–715; by Bill of 1918, 880–881; Jews admitted to, 688; property qualification for, abolished, *ib.*; atheists admitted to, 712; increase of powers of, and payment of members of, in 1911, 756; *see* Corrupt Practices Act, Quinquennial Act
Commonwealth of Australia, 770, 771

Commonwealth, the English, 344–349
Communion in both kinds, 216
Comperts, 211
Compound householders, 699
Compton, Spencer, successively Marquis of Hartington and Duke of Devonshire, 717, 723, 753
Comus, Milton's, 418
Confederacy, the Southern, 691
Conferences, *see* Colonial *and* Imperial
Confirmatio Cartarum, *see* Charters
Congregation, Lords of the, 242, 246
Congregationalists, 255, 350
Congresses, European, 613, 626, 627
Connaught, Duke of, 892
Connaught, Irish Province of, 316
Connolly, James, 887
Conscription, British, in the World War, 868–869, 883, 889, 890, 892, 893 and note
Conservative party, 654, 701, 710, 711; *see* Unionists
Consolidated fund, Pitt's, 576
Consols, 815 note
Conspiracies to Murder Bill, 688
Constable, John, 640–641
Constantine, king of the Greeks, 843
Constantinople, 199, 821
Constitutional Information, English Society for, 583
Constitutional royalists, the, 320, 325
Constitutions of Clarendon, *see* Clarendon
Consubstantiation, 151
"Contemptible little army," the World War, 836, 838, 846
Continental Congress, 528, 530
Continental system, Napoleon's, 602–603, 606, 608, 615, 633
Continuous voyage, doctrine of, 859
Contraband, 535, 687, 859
Conventicle Act, 365
Convention, the Irish, 888–889
Convention Parliament, the, of the Restoration, 356–357, 361–363; of William of Orange, 398–399, 424–425
Convocation, beginning of, 115; under Henry VIII, 208; under Elizabeth, 265
Cook, Captain James, 553, 554, 769
Coolies, *see* Chinese
Cooper, Sir Anthony Ashley, first Earl of Shaftesbury, in the "Cabal," 372–375; organizes the Country party in the Lords, 372; activity in the Popish Plot and the Exclusion struggle, 377, 382; flight and death, 382, 383
Cooper, Anthony Ashley, third Earl of Shaftesbury, 557
Cooper, Anthony Ashley, seventh Earl of Shaftesbury, 656, 670
Coöperative movement, the, 748
Coote, Colonel Eyre, 503
Cope, Sir John, 485
Copenhagen, bombardments of, 598, 599, 602
Copernicus, 200
Corn laws, 187, 623, 666; repeal of, 671–673; *see* Chamberlain *and* Tariff Reform
Cornwall, Duchy of, 662 notes
Cornwall, tin mines of, 11; rebellion in, 232
Cornwallis, Lord, in the American War, 535–536; in Ireland, 595–596
Coronel, 856
Coroners or crowners, 82
Corporation Act, 364; repeal of, 624
Corporations, municipal, war on charters of, 383, 393; reform of, 659
Correspondence Society, the London, 583
Corrupt Practices Act, 715 note
Corsned, 45
Cotters, 43
Cotton, manufacture, 549, 633; famine, 692
Council, *see* Privy
Council of the North, 268
Council of Wales and the Marches, 268, 323
Councilors, town, 85, 659
Councils, county, 719; district and parish, 15, 721 note
Count of the Saxon Shore, 14
Counter-Reformation, the, 249; *see also* Mary
Country gentry in the seventeenth century, 406
Country party, 376
County franchise and representation, *see* Commons, House of
County councils, *see* Councils
Courts, of Appeal, 708; of Common Law, 118; *see* Supreme Court of Judicature Act
Covenanters, the, 341, 346, 391
Covenant, the bond or, 242; Scottish National, 314–315; the Solemn League and, 332; the Ulster, 758
Cowper (coo'per), William, 636
Cox, Sir Percy, 899
Craddock, Admiral, 856
Craft gilds, *see* Gilds
Craftsman, the, 476
Cranborne, Viscount, *see* Cecil, Robert
Cranmer, Thomas, Archbishop of Canterbury, enters service of Henry VIII, 206; made Archbishop and pronounces sentence of divorce, 208; his Bible, 216; his Prayer Books and Articles, 227, 231–232, 234; his martyrdom, 239
Crécy (craysee or cressy), 128, 144
Creeds, the three, 213
Crete, 822
Crew, Chief Justice, 312
Crime, in the eighteenth century, 567; in the nineteenth century, 642, 643, 744
Crimean War, the, 682–687
Criminal code, reform of, 642–643
Criminous clerks, 72, 73
Cromer, Lord, *see* Baring, Evelyn
Cromwell, Oliver, early parliamentary career of, 320; opinion of first recruits, 329; his "Ironsides" and New Model, 331, 334, 335; at Marston Moor and Naseby, 333, 335; development of his political and religious views, 336, 338, 339; crushes second Civil War, 341; takes lead in proceedings against the King, 341, 342; as a preserver of order, 345; his conquest of Ireland and Scotland, 345, 346; his victory at Worcester, 347; dissolves Rump, 348, 349; as Lord Protector, 349–354; death and estimate of, 354–355; French policy, 366; commerce and agriculture under, 402, 404; attitude toward the arts, 420, 421
Cromwell, Richard, 355, 356
Cromwell, Thomas, enters service of Henry VIII, 206, 207; suggestion regarding the divorce, 207; activity in suppressing the monasteries, 210–212; nobles jealous of, 213; his fall, 217; management of Parliament, 222
"Cromwellian settlement," 346
Cronje, General, 777
Crown, lands, 267, 764; pleas, 76, 82; revenues, *see* Revenues
Cruelty to animals, prevention of, 642
Crusades, the first, 63; the third, 80, 81; influence of, 104
Culloden (cŭl-lō'den), 486, 487
Cumberland, *see* William Augustus

Cumbrian Mountains, 3
Curia Regia, the, 59, 65, 78
Customs duties, 138, 139; *see also* Chamberlain, Huskisson, Peel, Pitt
Cynewulf, 48
Cyprus, 803 note

D

Daguerre, 739
Dail Eireann, 890
Dalhousie (dalhoo'zie), Earl, later Marquis of, 785
Dalrymple (dalrim'ple), John, Master of Stair, 429, 430
Dalton (dôl'ton), John, 635
Danby, Earl of, *see* Osborne, Sir Thomas
Danegeld, 36, 59 note, 78
Danelagh, 31
Danes, *see* Northmen
Dante, 149
D'Arc, *see* Jeanne
Dardanelles, 687, 802, 841, 855
Darien Company, 452
Darlington, Counters of, *see* Kielmannsegge
Darnley, Earl of, *see* Stewart, Henry
Darwin, Charles, 737, 738, 815
Davis, Jefferson, 690, 691
Davy, Sir Humphrey, 635
Debasement, *see* Coinage
Debates, struggle over reporting, 525, 526
Debt, *see* National Debt
Declarations, of Breda, *see* Breda; of Charles I concerning religion, 307; of Independence, 531; of Indulgence, 374, 392, 394; of James II, 431; of Monmouth, 386; of Paris, 687; of the Rights of Man, 581; of Sports, 310; of William of Orange, 396
Decorative Art, Victorian, 743
De donis conditionalibus, *see* Entails
"Defender of the Faith," 194
Defense, Imperial, *see* Imperial
Defense of the Realm Acts, 869
Defense of the Seven Sacraments, Henry VIII's, 194
Defoe, Daniel, 561, 562
De Grasse, Admiral, 538, 539
De haeretico comburendo, 164
Deists, the, 557
Delbrück Law, 809
Delcassé, M., 806
Delegates, High Court of, 265
Delhi, 493, 788–790
Democracy, awakening of, 697–698; effect on literature, 730
Democratic Federation, 749
Denmark, 299, 598, 599, 602, 721; *see also* Schleswig-Holstein
Deorham, battle of, 21
Depositions, *see* Edward II, James II, Richard II; papal bulls of, 92, 208 note
De Quincey, Thomas, 639
Derby (där'by), Earls of, *see* Stanley
Derby, races, 412
Derbyshire insurrection, 617
De religiosis, *see* Mortmain
Desmond, House of, 254
Despensers, the, 122, 123
Devereux (dev'erroo') Robert, second Earl of Essex, 244, 261, 262 note
Devereux, Robert, third Earl of Essex, 320, 321; Commander of the Parliamentary forces, 326, 330–332, 334
Devolution, 722 note; *see* Federation
Devonport, Lord, 874
Devonshire, Duke of, *see* Compton, Spencer; Duchess of, *see*, Georgiana
De Wet, General, 777–778, 895
Dialogue of the Exchequer, 83
Diaz, Bartholomew, 272 note
Dickens, Charles, 734–735
"Die-Hards," the, 756
Diocletian, Roman Emperor, 14
Direct Action, 876
Director General of Recruiting, 869
Directory, in France, 581 note, 589, 590, 598
Disarming Act, in Scotland, 488
Discovery, under the Tudors, 191–192, 271–272
Disestablishment, of the Irish Church, 703–704; of the Welsh Church, 757
Dispensing power, 398; abolished, 425 and note
Disraeli (disrāy'ly or disree'ly), Benjamin, struggle for protection in Commons, 669, 672–673; abandons protection, 682; pronouncement on coalitions, *ib.*; passes Reform Bill of 1867, 698–700; first Ministry and estimate of, 700–701; comment of, Gladstone's first Ministry, 708; second Ministry, 710–711; his novels, 734; purchase of Suez Canal shares, 781; policy in Russo-Turkish War, 801–804
Dissenters, the Protestant, after the Restoration, 357; after Clarendon Code, 365–366; attitude of Charles II toward, 360, 362, 363, 365, 372, 374; efforts of James to win over, 392, 394; gain toleration, 424, 425; repeal of Test and Corporation Acts favor, 624; measures in relief of, 660; status of, at Victoria's accession, 661
Dissolution of the monasteries, 210–212, 214–216; effect of, on the poor, 225
Divine Right of Kings, views of James I on, 287; of Charles II, 360; blow at, 399; decline in belief in, 473
"Divorce" of Henry VIII and Catharine, 198, 203–204, 206–208; *see also* Anne of Cleves
Divorce, law of, 491–492; court, 708
Dock strike, 767
Dolichocephalic skulls, 7, 9
Domesday Survey, 56
Domestic system, 189–190, 552
Dominican friars, 104, 105
Dominion, of Canada, 765; of New Zealand, 772
Dominion system advocated for Ireland, 889–890
Don Pacifico case, 680, 681
Donne, John, 417
"Doras," *see* Defense of the Realm
Douay, college at, 254
Dover, the treaty of, 373–374, 378
Drake, Sir Francis, 258–259, 272
Drama, beginning of the, 148–149; Elizabethan, 280–283; Jacobean, Caroline and Restoration, 419–420; under Anne and the Georges, 564–565; Victorian, 733
Drapier Letters, Swift's, 472
Dreadnaught type, 813
Dress, Elizabethan, 275–276; Restoration, 412; eighteenth-century, 568; early nineteenth century, 641
Drinking, in the fourteenth century, 143; in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, 641–642; wartime control of, 781 and note, 872
Drogheda, massacre of, 345
Druidism, 10–12
Dryden, John, 419
Dudley, Dud, 401
Dudley, Guilford, 234, 237
Dudley, John, successively Earl of Warwick and Duke of Northumberland, 233–236
Dudley, Robert, Earl of Leicester, 244, 257, 262, 275
Dueling, 410, 642
Dumping, 810, 881
Dunajec, 840

Dunbar, battle of, 346
Duncan, Admiral, 592
Dundee, Viscount, *see* Graham, John
Dunstan, St., 33–35
Dunwich, borough of, 648
Dupleix, 493
Duquesne, Fort, 494, 499
"Durham letter," the, 479
Durham, palatinate of, 54
Durham, Lord, 764–765; his Report, 763, 765
Dutch, the, as trade rivals of the English, 272, 312, 402, 547; at Beachy Head, 427; in the War of the Spanish Succession, 443, 446–451, 453–455, 458, 459; in the Triple Alliance, 1717, 467; send auxiliaries to Great Britain in 1715 and 1745, 466, 486; in the Triple Alliance of 1788, 582, 583; in the Great French War, 583–585, 588–592, 599, 610–612; Belgians rebel against, 630–631
Dutch Wars, the first, 347–348, 351; the second, 366–368; the third, 375
Dynamiters, the Fenian, 703, 714
Dykevelt, his mission to England, 392–393

E

Eadgar the Ætheling, 39, 40, 53
Ealdormen, 33, 36, 46; *see also* Earl
Earls, Anglo-Saxon, 37, 47; after the Conquest, 54
East Africa Company, the British, 774
Eastern Association, army of the, 321, 329
East India Company, the Dutch, 272, note; the English founded, 272, 273; growth of, 493; condition of, at Seven Years' War, North's Regulating Act, Warren Hastings, and Fox's India Bill, 570–573; Pitt's India Bill, 575; reduction of privileges of, 785, 786; powers of, transferred to the Crown, 791; the French, 493, 503
East Indian laborers in South Africa, 779 and note
Ecclesiastical Commission, 658, 660; court of, 389–390, 396
Ecclesiastical jurisdiction, under William I and Stephen, 55, 72; under Henry II, 72, 73; under the Tudors, 265
Ecclesiastical Polity, Hooker's, 279
Ecclesiastical Titles Bill, 679
Economic theory, in the seventeenth century, 415, 416; in the eighteenth century, 558, 559; in the nineteenth century, 636, 737
Edgar the Peaceful, Anglo-Saxon King, 35, 36
Edgehill, battle of, 330
Edgeworth, Maria, 639
Edict of Nantes, 262, 388
"Edinburgh Letter," Russell's, 671
Edinburgh Review, the, 640, 731
Edmund (Crouchback) of Lancaster, 100, 103, 116, 159 note
Edmund Ironside, 36, 37
Edred, 35
Education, under the Tudors, 226, 227, 235; in the seventeenth century, 405, 406; Bills of 1870, 1902, 1906, 705–707, 755; made free, 720; Bill of, 1918, 879–880
Edward the Elder, 33
Edward "The Martyr," 36
Edward the Confessor, 38–40
Edward I, King of England, as Prince, 102–103; accession and character, 111; subdues Wales, 111–112; his French and Scotch wars, 112–113, 116–118; summons Model Parliament, 115; his confirmation of the charters, 116–117; as legislator and ruler, 112, 118–121; his expulsion of the Jews, 120; trade regulations of, 138–139; asserts sovereignty of the seas, 139
Edward II, King of England, first Prince of Wales, 112; as Regent, 116; his reign and deposition, 121–123
Edward III, King of England, chosen King, 123; assumes the government, 125; his character, 125, 126; assumes title of King of France, 126; enters Hundred Years' War, 126–128; victory at Crécy, 128; capture of Calais, 128, 129; ceases to take an active part in the war, 129; troubles with subjects, 129, 134–135; his death, 136; secures sovereignty of the seas, 139
Edward IV, King of England, his struggle for the succession, 173, 174; his reign, 175–178
Edward V, 178–180
Edward VI, King of England, as Prince, 217–218, 233; his reign, 230–235
Edward VII, King of Great Britain and Emperor of India, character and reign, 752–756; his foreign relations, 806–808, 813
Edward, the Black Prince, at Crécy and Poitiers, 128, 132; régime in Guyenne, 133–134; his opposition to the Court party and death, 134, 135
Edward, Prince, son of Henry VI, 172, 177
Edward, Earl of Warwick, son of the Duke of Clarence, 184 and note; *see* Simnel
Edwin, Northumbrian King, 24
Edwin, Earl of Mercia, 40
Egbert, West Saxon King, 29, 30
Egypt, in the Napoleonic Wars, 582, 597, 599; early history and the British occupation of, 780–784; the Anglo-French agreement concerning, 784, 806–807; in the World War, 819, 896–897; British Labor Party demand Home Rule for, 878
Eighteenth century, leading characteristics, 543
Elba, island of, 608, 610
Eldon, Lord Chancellor, 615, 625
El Dorado, 273
Eleanor of Aquitaine, Queen of Henry II, 69, 75
Eleanor of Provence, Queen of Henry III, 99
Election, the Clare, 624
Elections, disputed, *see* Goodwin's Case, Wilkes, *and* Grenville Act; bribery in, 649
Elective Ministers, baronial demand for, 100
Electricity, 739–740
Elgar, Sir Edward, 744
Eliot, Sir John, 304, 307, 308
Eliott, General, defender of Gibraltar, 534, 539
Elizabeth, Countess Palatine, 295, and note, 440 and note
Elizabeth, Queen of England, as Princess, 208, 210, 234, 237; accession and character, 244–245; her religious settlement, 245–246; her Scotch policy, 246–248; relation to Catholics and Catholic Powers, 248–250; plots against, 248, 251, 254, 255, 259; attitude toward Protestant extremists, 255–257; intervention in the Netherlands, 257; support of English seamen, 257–259; her part in Mary's execution, 259; her part in the repulse of the Armada and the final struggle with Philip II, 259–262; declining years and death, 262,

263; strength of her monarchy, 264–265; restoration of the coinage, 270; agricultural and trade policy, 271, 274; her progresses, 275; estimate of her reign, 283, 284
Elizabeth of York, 184
Ely, monks of, 37; island of, 55
Embargo Act, 608
Emden, German raider, 856
Emigration, 762, 763
Emma, Queen, 37
Empire, *see* British Colonies *and* British Empire
Enclosures, beginning of, 142; in the fifteenth century, 187; in the sixteenth century, 215, 224, 233, 270–271; in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, 554, 635
Encumbered Estates Act, 677, 704
Encyclopedists, the, 414
Engagement, the, 340
England, area, 1; productiveness, 5; origin of the name, 21; under the Anglo-Norman Kings, 57–61, 65–67; at the close of the twelfth century, 82–87; in the thirteenth century, 104–110; under the first three Edwards, 129–132, 137–152; in the fifteenth century, 186–192; development of sea power of, 257–262; under Elizabeth, 264–284; in the seventeenth century, 400–422; material character of, under the first two Georges, 473–474; condition of, in the eighteenth century, 543–568; conditions in, 1815–1830, 615; at the eve of the Reform Bill, 633–643; under Victoria, 727–751; *see* Great Britain
English language, in the law courts, 132, 476
Englishry, presentment of, 55
Enniskillen, 426, 427
Entails, 119
Entente, the Dual, or *Entente cordiale*, 784, 806, 807; the Triple, 793, 808
Enumerated goods, 514
Episcopacy in Scotland, 291, 314–315
Episcopal elections, 64, 91–92, 95, 265
Epsom, 412
Erasmus, 200–201, 226–227
Erie, Lake, battle on, 609
Ernest Augustus, Duke of Cumberland, 662
Erskine, John, Earl of Mar, 465–466
Escheats, 58
Essay on Man, *see* Pope; *on Woman*, *see* Wilkes
Essayists, 559, 639
Essex, Earls of, *see* Devereux, Robert *and* Capel, Arthur
Ethandun, 31
Ethelfleda, 33
Eugene, Prince, 447, 449, 451, 454, 458
Euphuism, 278
Evangelicals, the, 727, 729
Evans, Mary Ann, 735, 736
Evesham, battle of, 103
Evolution, *see* Darwin
Exchequer, the, 66, 78, 83; Court, 268, 290
Excise, Walpole's, 477; Irish, 717
Exclusion, bills against James, 376, 381–382; of the Ulster counties, 759, 882
Excommunication, of John, 91–92; of Henry VIII, 208 and note
Exhibition, the Great, 679
Ex officio oath, 266, 287
Exploration, under the Tudors, 271–273
Exports, British, 4, 633, 809–811; duties on, abolished, 669
Eye, the witch of, 170

F

Fabian Society, 750
Factory, Acts, 656–657, 670, 746 and note; system, 550, 552, 553
Faerie Queene, the, 280
Fairfax, Thomas, Parliamentary Commander, 330, 333–335, 338, 341, 345
Fairs, 86, 108
Falkirk, battle of, 117
Falkland Islands, battle of, 856
Falkland, Lord, 413
Family Compacts, the, 480, 483, 508
Famines, 110, 146, 671, 676
"Fantastic School," the, 417
Faraday, Michael, 739–740
"Farmer George," *see* George III
Faro banks, 641
Fashoda Incident, the, 784 note
Fawkes, Guy, 288, 679
Federation, *see* Australia, Canada, Imperial, Ireland
Felony, counsel in cases of, 660
Felton, John, 306
Fenians, 703, 712
Fens, draining of the, 403
Fenwick (fen'ick), Sir John, 434
Feorum fultum, 46
Ferdinand of Aragon, 186, 195, 196
Ferdinand, Prince of Brunswick, 499, 501, 502
Feud, the, 44
Feudal, dues, 267, 290; grievances under John, 93, 95; incidents, 58, 59; system abolished, 362
Feudalism, 57–59
Field, Cyrus, 740
Field deputies, *see* Dutch in the War of the Spanish Succession
Field of Cloth of Gold, 197, 223
Fielding, Henry, 562
Filmer, Sir Robert, 414, 415
Financial effort, Great Britain's, in the World War, 832 and note 875
Fining of juries abolished, 359
Fire of London, the, 368–369, 410
Firma burgi, 85
First fruits, *see* Annates.
Fisher, Admiral, Lord, 866–867
Fisher, H. A. L., 879
Fisher, John, Bishop of Rochester, 209–210
Fitch, Ralph, 272
Fitzgeralds, the, Earls of Kildare, 218–219
Fitzherbert, Mrs., 619 note
Five boroughs, the, 33
Five Knights' case, the, 305–306
Five Mile Act, the, 365
Flagellants, the, 130
Flambard, *see* Ranulf
Flanders, 116; in the Hundred Years' War, 127–128, 133
Fleet marriages, 491
Flemish weavers, 139, 140
Flodden, battle of, 195
Flogging illegal for women, 643
Flood, Henry, 538
Florida, 510, 541, 675
Florio, John, 278
"Flying Coach," 404
Flying shuttle, 550
Foch, General (later Marshal), 838, 850–853
Folk, *see* Tribe
Folkmoot, 45
Fontenoy, the battle of, 484
Food, 143, 188, 412; control of, during World War, 873–874, 893
Forced loans, *see* Loans
Foreign Enlistment Act, 710 note
Foreign policy, *see various countries*
Forests, under William I, 55, 56
Forfeiture, 58
Forty-shilling freeholders, *see* Freeholders
"Forwards," *see* "Die-Hards"
Fountains Abbey, 67
Four Days' Battle, the, 467

Fox, Charles James, 538; character and American policy, 537–538; coalition with North, 570; his India Bill and conflict with Pitt, 573, 574; abolishes slave trade, 578; position on the Regency question, 579–580; attitude toward French Revolution and breach with Burke, 581–582; Foreign Secretaryship and death, 601–602; his dress, 641
Fox, Henry (later Lord Holland), 495, 496, 539
Foxe, John, 239, 280
France, war with Edward I, 113–114, 117; Edward III assumes title of King of, 126; Hundred Years' War during reign of Edward III, 126–129, 132–134; under Richard II, 153; under Henry V and Henry VI, 165–170; end of war, 172; relations of Edward IV with, 176–178; relations of Henry VII with, 195–198, 205, 217–218; Somerset's policy toward, 233; Mary's war with, and loss of Calais, 240; Elizabeth's relations with, 245, 248, 253–262; marriage treaty with, 1624, 299; relations of Charles I with, 304–305, 312–313; Cromwell's alliance with, 351–352; alliance of Charles II with, 360, 366, 373–374; aids Dutch, 368; English feeling against, 375; later policy of Charles toward, 377; relations of James II with, 385, 388; aids James II, 397, 426; William III's war against, 430–432, 435; in the War of the Spanish Succession, 441–443, 446–451, 453–455, 457–459; aids the old Pretender, 465; in Triple Alliance, 467; in War of the Austrian Succession, 480–485, 489–490; aids Prince Charles, 484, 485; in the Seven Years' War, 492–496, 497–504, 508–510; in the American Revolution, 533–536, 539–541; significance of eighteenth century wars with, 545–548; Pitt's commercial treaty with, 576–577; Revolution in, and effect on England, 580–585; war with, to peace of Amiens, 585–595; from Amiens to the overthrow of Napoleon, 600–613; intervenes in Spain in 1820, 627; allied with Great Britain to assist Greeks, 629–630; Revolution of 1830 in, 630; effect of, on England, 631; Revolution of 1848 in, 677; *see* Don Pacifico Case; in Crimean War, 682–687; *see* Orsini; assists in Italian Unity, 688–689; proposes mediation in American Civil War, 692; *see* Palmerston; in War with Prussia, 709–710; relations with Great Britain in Egypt, 780–784; *see Entente*, Fashoda, *and* Morocco; British strained relations with, after 1870, 800; *Entente* with, under Edward VII, 806–808, 813; Great Britain supports, in 1911, 821; in negotiations of 1914, 825–829; in the World War, 833, 836–854; in Syria, 890
France, Isle de, 493
Franchise, previous to Reform Bill of 1832, 648–650; by Bill of 1832, 653; by Bill of 1867, 699; by Bill of 1885, 714–715; by Bill of 1918, 880–881; *see also* Reform Bills
Francis, St., 104–105
Francis, Sir Philip, 523
Franciscan friars, 104, 105, 209
Franco-Austrian War, 688–689
Franco-Prussian War, 709–710
Franklin, Benjamin, 515, 526, 527, 533, 540 and note; experiments with electricity, 555, 556
Franz Ferdinand, *see* Serajevo
Frederick II (the Great), King of Prussia, character and aims, 481; in the War of the Austrian Succession, 481–482, 484, 489; in the Seven Years' War, 495–496, 499–504; breaks with England, 509–510; cynical views of, 815
Frederick, Prince, son of George II, 507
Free, Church of Scotland, 730; United Presbyterian, *ib.*
Freedom of Speech, 398
Freeholders, forty-shilling, 649–650, 653
Free trade, 668–673
French, General (later Marshal, Viscount), 759, 760, 837–838, 841, 844–845
Friars, *see* Dominicans *and* Franciscans
Friends of the People, 582 note
Friendly Societies, 744, 747 and note
Frobisher, Martin, 272
Froissart, Jean, 148
Fry, Elizabeth, 745
Fulton, Robert, 634

G

Gaels, 10
Gage, General, 531
Gainsborough, Thomas, 565
Gallipoli campaign, 840–843
Gama, Vasco da, 272 note
Gambling, 412, 567, 641
Game Laws, 642
Gaol Acts, 745
Gardiner, Stephen, Bishop of Winchester, 231, 233, 236, 239
Garrick, David, 565
Garter, Order of the, 129 note
Gas, use of, in World War, 834, 844
Gascony, under Henry III, 98–100; under Edward I, 113–114, 116; in the Hundred Years' War, *see* Guyenne; shipping law against, 191; *see also* Aquitaine
Gaskell, Mrs., 736
Gates, General, 532
Gaunt, *see* John of
Gaveston, Piers, 122
General Assembly, of the Church of Scotland, 241, 286, 315; *see* Veto Act
General Staff, 754 note
General warrants, 511 and note, 519
Geneva Award, 710
Geoffrey of Anjou, 69
Geoffrey of Monmouth, 61, 83
George I, King of England, reign of, 463–474
George II, King of England, as Prince, 475; reign of, 475–504
George III, King of Great Britain and Ireland, significance of reign, 506; character and policy, 507–508; ends the Seven Years' War, 509–510; opposition to Wilkes, 511; supports Grenville program, 512, 515 note; dismissal of Grenville, 518; opposes Rockingham Ministry, 519; makes Lord North Premier, 523; controls the Ministry, 525; secures Royal Marriage Act, 526; aims to coerce Massachusetts, 528; rejoices prematurely, 532; refuses to yield to the Opposition, 534; disperses Gordon rioters, 535; wishes to continue the American War, 537; attempts to thwart Rockingham, *ib.*; dismisses his Ministry, 540; defeat of his policy, 541; opposes the Coalition, 570; defeats Fox's India Bill, 573; calls in Pitt, *ib.*; attitude toward Hastings, 578–579; his insanity and recovery,

579; opposes Catholic relief, 596–597; final eclipse, 605; his death, 618
George IV, King of Great Britain and Ireland, as Prince, 570, 579–580; as Regent, 605, 616; as King, 618–620, 625–626
George V, King of Great Britain and Ireland, Emperor of India, his accession and visit to India, 756–757; signs Home Rule Bill, 760; changes name, 871–872 note
George, Duke of Clarence, brother of Edward IV, 176–178
George, David Lloyd, his socialistic legislation, 748; his budget, 755; his plea for reduction of armaments, 823 note; reiterates British War aims, 850; attempts to save in armaments, 865; becomes Minister of Munitions, 867; becomes Premier, *ib.*; *see* Treasury Agreement; his War Cabinet, 868; his activity in producing munitions, 871 and note; his appointments, 878–879; his tribute to women's war work, 880; victory of his Coalition, 881–882; offers Irish Convention, 888; calls Imperial Conferences, 906, 907
Georgia, colony of, 566
Georgiana, Duchess of Devonshire, 574
Gerald de Barri, *see* Giraldus Cambrensis
Geraldines, *see* Fitzgerald
German East Africa, *see* Africa
German, North, Confederation, 700; Empire founded, 709
German raids, 834, 858
German Southwest Africa, *see* Africa
Germanic invasions, 14, 18–21
Germans, condition of the ancient, 18–20
Germany, Bismarck's social legislation in, 746; secures Heligoland for concessions in Africa, 774; activities in the East, 792–793; Bismarck's policy, 799–801; attitude in Russo-Turkish War, 801–804; in Triple Alliance, 804; new policies under William II, 804–805; in the Morocco crises of 1905 and 1911, 807–808, 820–821; rivalry with England in trade and naval armaments, 810–815; Kultur and Pan-Germanism, 815–818; Eastern policy, 818–822; backs Austria after Serajevo, 823–824; violation of Belgium, 827–829; resources of, in 1914, 832–835; disappointment at British entrance into war, 836; campaign of 1914, 836–839; of 1915, 839–845; of 1916, 845–847; peace drive, 847; campaign of 1917, 847–849; 1918 drive, 850–851; final repulse, 851–853; the Armistice, 853–854; in naval warfare, 854–859; submarine warfare, 859–862; surrenders her fleet, 862–863; production of shells, 867 note; intrigues with the Irish, 884, 885; raid in behalf of Sinn Feiners, 886; propaganda in South Africa, 895; loses Colonies, 895–896; activity in Egypt, 897; intrigues in India, 900–901
Ghent, treaty of, 609–610
Gibbon, Edward, 556
Gibraltar, British secure, 450, 459; Spanish attempts to recover, 534, 539; government of, 761
Gilbert, Sir Humphrey, 273
Gilbert and Sullivan, 744
Gilds, origin and growth of, 86; in the thirteenth century, 109; in the fourteenth century, 140–141, 148, 153–154; in the fifteenth century, 189–190; under Henry VIII, 224; under Elizabeth, 274; in the seventeenth century, 409; as ancestors of Friendly Societies, 747 note; *see also* National Guilds
Gin drinking, act to check, 566
Giraldus Cambrensis, 84
Gladstone (glad'ston), William E., early budgets of, 682; in Palmerston's second administration, 689; his repeal of the paper duty, 689–690; in sympathy with South in American Civil War, 690–691; Disraeli on policy of, toward Victoria, 701; character and policy of, 701–702; first Ministry of, 702–709; first Ministry of, foreign affairs, 709–710; campaign speeches, 711; second Ministry of, 712–715; his Land Act of 1881, 713; his Franchise Bill of 1884, 1885, 714–715; fall of his second Ministry, 715; adopts Home Rule, 716; his third Ministry and the defeat of his first Home Rule Bill, 717; repudiates Parnell, 719; his fourth Ministry and the defeat of his second Home Rule Bill, 720–721; threatens the Lords, 723; his resignation, *ib.*; death of, 723 note; his High Churchmanship, 729; his disastrous South African policy, 773–774; his failure to relieve Gordon, 783; denounces the Bulgarian atrocities, 801
Glamorgan, Earl of, 336
Glanville, Ranulf de, 83
Glasgow, 6
Glastonbury, Abbey of, 15
Glencoe, the Massacre of, 429, 430
Glendower, Owen, 162
"Glorious Revolution," the, *see* Revolution of 1688
Gloucester, 331–332
Gloucester, the Duke of, *see* Thomas of Woodstock, Humphrey, *and* Richard
Godfrey, Sir Edmund Bury, 378
Godwin, William, 639
Godwine, Earl of Wessex, 38–39
Goidels, 10
Gold, discovery of, 742, 770 note
Goldsmith, Oliver, 563, 565
Good Hope, Cape of, 272 note, 599
Good Parliament, 134–135
Goodwin, Sir Francis, case of, 289
Gordon, General Charles ("Chinese Gordon"), in the Sudan, 783
Gordon, George, *see* Byron, Lord
Gordon Riots, 534–535
Gothic art, revival of, 732, 743
Government, British, growing paternalism of, at Victoria's accession, 661–662; control of industry during the World War, 866 ff.
Grafton, the Duke of, his Ministry, 520–523
Graham, John, of Claverhouse, later Viscount Dundee, 391, 429
Grail, the Holy, 15
Grammar schools, under Henry VIII, 227; of Edward VI, 235; *see also*, 706
Grand Alliance, the, 443
Grand National Consolidated Trade Union, the, 667
Grand Remonstrance, the, 324–325
Grand Tour, the, 641
Granville, Lord, 783
Grattan, Henry, 538, 592, 593, 595, 840, 842
Gray, Thomas, 564
Great Britain, name of, adopted at the union of England and Scotland, 453; territorial gains of, by the peace of Utrecht,

458–459; achievements of, in the War of the Spanish Succession, 459; struggle begins with American Colonies, 512; strength of, in American Revolution, 530; isolation of, by formation of "Armed Neutrality," 535, critical situation of, in 1796, 1797 and 1800–1801, 590, 598; territorial gains of, at Congress of Vienna, 612; relations to Europe at close of Napoleonic Wars, 626–631; effect of separation of Hanover upon, 662; sentiment in, regarding American Civil War, 690; problems confronting, 1865, 697; problems in 1901, 725; foreign policy of, after 1870, 799–804; *see* Entente; *also* Germany; policy of, previous to World War, 823–830; in the World War, 832 ff.
Great Contract, the, 290–291
Great Council, the, 59; summoned by Charles I, 317
Greater Britain, *see* British Colonies *and* Empire
Great Fire, the, 410, 421
Great Mogul, the, 492
Great Schism, 150
Great Seal, the, 397
Greece, independence of, 628–630; *see* Don Pacifico case; in the First and Second Balkan Wars, 821, 822; in the World War, 843, 853
Green Ribbon Club, 376
Greene, Nathaniel, General, 536
Greene, Robert, 279, 282
Greenwich, 416, 421
Gregory I, Pope, 22–23
Gregory XIII, Pope, 491
Grenville, George, 496 note; becomes Prime Minister, 510; his colonial program, 512, 516–518; his dismissal, 518–519; his Election Act, 525
Grenville, Lady Hester, 496 note
Grenville Election Act, the, of, 1770, 525
Grey, Charles, later Earl Grey, becomes Prime Minister, 647; Ministry of, secures Parliamentary Reform, 651–654; resignation of, 658; adviser to the bishops, 728
Grey, Lady Jane, 224–235, 236–237
Grey, Sir Edward, Foreign Minister, refuses to sign Portuguese treaty with Germany, 805; states British position in 1911, 817–818; forces signature of treaty of London in 1913, 822; his attempts to avert war in 1914, 825, 827, 829–830; his conciliatory attitude, 865
Griffith, Arthur, 883
Grocyn, William, 200
Grosseteste, *see* Robert
Grote, George, 737–738
Grouchy, Marshal, 611–612
Grub Street, 561 and note
Guesclin, Bertrand du, 133–134
Guinegate, the battle of, 195
Gulliver's Travels, 560
Gunpowder, early use of, 144
Gunpowder Plot, the, 288–289
Gutenberg, John, 192
Guthrum, Danish invader, 3
Guyenne, in the Hundred Years' War, 127, 129, 133–134; *see* Aquitaine *and* Gascony
Gwledig, British leader, 18

H

Habeas Corpus, 94, 96, 305 and note
Habeas Corpus Act, 359; passed, 381; James II aims to repeal the, 388; suspended, 589, 617 and note; in Ireland, 594
Hadrian's Wall, 13 note
Hague Conference, the first, 813; the second, *ib.*
Haidar Ali, 597
Haig, Sir Douglas (later Marshal, Viscount), 845, 848, 851–853
Haldane (hol'dane), Lord, 814, 818
Hakluyt, Richard, his *Voyages*, 273, 280
Hales, Sir Edward, the case of, 389
Halidon Hill, battle of, 126
Halifax, Earl of, *see* Montagu, Charles
Halifax, Marquis of, *see* Savile, George
Hal, Prince, *see* Henry V
Halsbury, Lord, 756
Hampden, John, 313, 320, 325, 332
Hampton Court Conference, the, 287–288
Hams, Anglo-Saxon, 42
Handel, George Frederick, 565, 744
Hanover, kingdom of, 602, 662, 700
Hansard, case of Stockdale against, 665
Hanseatic League, 108
Harden, Maximilian, 829 note
Hardinge, Lord, Viceroy of India, 892, 901 note, 902
Hardwicke's Marriage Act, 491–492
Hardy, Thomas, 736
Hargreaves, James, invents spinning jenny, 550
Harley, Robert, Earl of Oxford, intrigues with Mrs. Masham, 455; leading Minister of Anne, 456; negotiates for peace, 457; rivalry with Bolingbroke, 460; his dismissal, 460–461; founds the South Sea Company, 469
Harold, son of Godwine, 39–41
Harold Hadrada, King of Norway, 40
Hartington, Marquis of, *see* Compton, Spencer
Harvey, William, 416
Hastings, *see* Senlac
Hastings, Warren, 571–572, 578–579
Havana, 509–510
Havelock, Henry, 790
Hawke, Admiral, 501
Hawkins, John, 258, 272
Hay-Pauncefote treaty, 768
Hazlitt, William, 639–640
Heads of Proposals, the, 338–339
Health, public, in the Anglo-Saxon period, 50; in Anglo-Norman times, 60; in the twelfth century, 87; in the fourteenth century, 146; in the fifteenth century, 187–188; in the time of Henry VIII, 225
Hedjaz, King of the, 898, 900
Heligoland, 612, 774, 857
Hemans, Felicia, 730
Henderson, Arthur, 877
Hengist and Horsa, 18
Henrietta Maria, Queen of Charles I, betrothed to Charles, 299; character of, 303; fosters Roman Catholicism, 311; plots of, 322, 324; incites arrest of five members, 325; seeks foreign alliances, 328, 336
Henry I, King of England, accession and issue of Charter of Liberties, 63, 64; conquest of Normandy, 64; compromise with Anselm, *ib.*; character and policy, 64, 65; administrative reorganization, the Curia Regis and Exchequer 65, 66; founder of Curia Regis and Exchequer, 78; originator of scutage, 79; charters to London, 85; charter to Weavers' Gild, 86
Henry II, King of England, recognized as heir of Stephen, 69; accession and character, problems and policy, 71;

conflict with Becket, 72–74; in Ireland, 74–75; submission at Avranches, 75; last years and death, *ib.*; constitutional and legal reforms, 75–78; revenue of, 78–79; summary of his work, 79; literature and learning at his court, 82, 83; grants of borough charters, 85
Henry III, King of England, constitutional importance of his reign, 89; years of minority, 98, 99; successful expeditions against Gascony, 99–100; beginning of his personal rule, 99; marries Eleanor of Provence, invasions of foreigners, *ib.*; breach with Simon de Montfort, 100; baronial war against, 101–103; death and character of, 103
Henry of Lancaster, his conflict with Richard II, 158, 159; chosen king, 159; *see* Henry IV
Henry IV, King of England, 161–162; character and problems, 161–162; revolts against, 162–163; last years of, 163
Henry V, King of England, as Prince, 163; accession and character, 164–165; suppresses the Lollards, 164 note; reopens war with France, 165; his three invasions of France, 165–166; his death, estimate of his work, 166, 167
Henry VI, King of England, coronation of, 169; marries Margaret of Anjou, 170; struggles with the Yorkists, 170–177; his death and character, 177
Henry, Duke of Richmond, representative of the Lancastrian line, lands in England, 180; victory at Bosworth, 180–181; proclaimed King, 181; *see* Henry VII
Henry VII, King of England, problems and means of securing his title, 183, 184; trouble with pretenders, 185–185; establishes the Star Chamber, 185; Irish policy of, 185, 186; foreign policy of, 186; modern and medieval traits of, 186–187; measures to promote manufactures, trade, and discovery, 190–192
Henry VIII, King of England, marries Catharine of Aragon, 186; accession and character of, 194–195; joins the Holy Alliance, 195; invades Flanders, *ib.*; allies himself with Louis XII; favor to Wolsey, 195–196; unsuccessful candidate for the Imperial crown, 196; his alliance with Charles V, 197; meeting with Francis I at the Field of Cloth of Gold, *ib.*; withdraws from the European war, 198; motives of, for separation from Rome, 198, 199; a patron of the New Learning, 202; his divorce proceedings against Catharine, 203–204; throws over Wolsey, 204–205; takes Cranmer and Cromwell as advisers, 206; summons the Reformation Parliament and brings about the separation from Rome, 207–210; restricts powers of Convocation, 208; marries Anne Boleyn, *ib.*; secures divorce from Catharine, *ib.*; persecutions, 209–210; assumes title of Supreme Head, *ib.*; his dissolution of the monasteries, 210–212; divorces and executes Anne Boleyn, 212; marries Jane Seymour, *ib.*; imposes the Ten Articles on the Church, 213; attitude of, toward the Pilgrimage of Grace, 214; disposal of the spoils of monasteries, 215–216; forces the Six Articles on Parliament, 216–217; marries and divorces Anne of Cleves, 217; throws over Cromwell, *ib.*; Scotch policy, 217–218; war with France, 218; Irish policy, 218–219; closing years and death of, 222–223; nature of his absolutism, his revenue, and his extravagance, 223–224; attitude toward education, 226–227; character of his age, 227
Henry, son of Henry II, 75
Henry, Prince, son of James I, 289, 294
Henry, Cardinal of York, son of the Old Pretender, 487
Henry of Navarre (later Henry IV, King of France), 253, 257, 262
Henry, Bishop of Winchester, 68
Hepburn (heb'bûrn), James, Earl of Bothwell, 247
Heptarchy, 21
Herbert, Admiral (later Earl of Torrington), 427
Herbert, George, 417
Heresy laws, 164, 231, 238; *see De haeretico comburendo*
Heretics, persecution of, 207, 238–240
Heritable jurisdictions, abolished in Scotland, 488
Herrick, Robert, 418
Hertford, Earl of, *see* Seymour, Edward
Hertzog, General, 779, 894
Herzegovina, 801–803, 820
Hide, 42
High Church party, views and aims of, under Charles I, 302–303; under the direction of Laud, 309–310; alliance with Charles II, 376; alienated by James II, 392–395; reaction of, against William III, 424; principles of, 446; opposes the Union, 453; alienated by the Education Act of 1870, 708; *see* Sacheverel *and* Oxford Movement
High Commission, the Court of, begins to be active, 249; enlarged powers of, 256; under Elizabeth and the early Stuarts 265–266; abolished, 323; *see* Ecclesiastical Commission
High Court of Delegates, the, 265
High Court of Justice, 342; *see also* Supreme Court of Judicature Act
Highlands, the Scottish, 5–6, 429
Highwaymen, 405, 567
Hill, Abigail, *see* Masham
Hill, Rowland, Post Office reforms of, 665, 666
Historical writing, 280, 556, 731, 737–738
Hindenburg, Marshal von, 847; Hindenburg Line, 852, 853
Hobbes, Thomas, 414
Hogarth, William, 565
Hohenlinden, battle of, 598
Holbein, 217
Holinshed's *Chronicles*, 280
Holland, joins the Armed Neutrality of 1778, 535; England declares war against, 1780, *ib.*; decline of, 547; Orange Party of, in Triple Alliance, 583; States General of, appeal to England for aid, 584; France declares war on, 1793, 585; France prepares to invade, *ib.*; Batavian Republic set up in, 589; Belgium declares her independence from, 890; *see also* Netherlands, Dutch *and* Austrian *and* Spanish Succession, wars of the
Holland, Lord, *see* Fox, Henry
Holles, Denzil, 307–308
Holstein, Duchy of, 693
Holy Alliance, the, 612

Holy Grail, 15, 148
Holy League, 195
Holy Places, the, in Palestine, 683
Holyrood palace, 247
Holy Sepulcher, the, 683
Home Rule, origin of the movement, 712; adopted by Gladstone, 716; defeat of Gladstone's first bill for, 716–717; Ulster opposition to, 716 note; the Conservative substitute for, 720; defeat of Gladstone's second bill in the Lords, 720–721; the problem, 721–723; becomes an issue in the election of 1910, 755–766; revival of the struggle for 757–760; becomes law, 760; suspended during the World war, 880–884; *see* Sinn Fein *and* Irish Convention; the Problem of, 889–890
Hong-Kong, 674
Honorius, Roman Emperor, 14
Hood, Admiral, Lord, 589
Hooker, Richard, 279
Horne, General, 853
Hotspur, *see* Percy, Henry
Household franchise, 653
House of Commons, *see* Commons
House of Lords, *see* Lords
House, the "Other," under the Protectorate, 354
"Hovering Act," the, 576
Howard, Lord Charles, of Effingham (later Earl of Nottingham), 260
Howard, Catharine, *see* Catharine
Howard, Henry, Earl of Surrey, poet, 220, 228
Howard, John, prison reformer, 566–567, 745
Howard, Thomas, Earl of Surrey and Duke of Norfolk, 195, 214, 220, 337
Howard, Thomas, fourth Duke of Norfolk, 248, 251
Howe, General, 531–532, 534
Howe, Admiral, Lord, 591
Hubert de Burgh, Justiciar, 98–99
Hubert Walter, Archbishop, 81–83, 91
Hudson Bay Company, 766
Hugh, St., Bishop of Lincoln, 82
Hughes, Thomas, 749
Hughes, W. M., 906
Huguenots, 244, 253, 305; introduction of new industries into England by, 401, 548
Humanism, 199
Humber River, 4
Humble Petition and Advice, the, 354
Hume, David, 356–357
Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, 166, 168, 170, 200
"Hundred Days," the, 610
Hundreds, Anglo-Saxon, 44, 45; responsibility of the, 55
Hundred Years' War, the, significance of, 126; causes of, 126–127; opening campaigns, 127–128; Crécy, 128; capture of Calais, 128; Poitiers, 132; peace of Brétigny, 132–133; turning of the tide against England, 133; longbow and firearms in, 144; reopened by Henry V, 165; his three invasions of France, 165–166; siege of Orléans, and relief of, by Jeanne d'Arc, 168–169; end of, 172; effect on the nobility, 183
Hunt, Holman, 743
Hunt, Leigh, 639
Hunting, in Anglo-Saxon times, 50; in the seventeenth century, 406; *see* Game Laws
Huskisson, William, 620–622
Huss, John, 151
Hussein, Kamel, 897–900 note; *see also* Hedjaz
Hutchinson Letters, the, 763
Huxley, Thomas, 739
Hyde, Anne, 374, 376 and note
Hyde, Dr. Douglas, 883
Hyde, Edward, Earl of Clarendon, leader of the Constitutional royalists and author of the *History of the Great Rebellion*, 320, 325, 360; made Lord Chancellor, his character and policy, 361; his Code, 364–366; foreign policy of, 366; the fall of, 368–369
Hyde Park, reform demonstration in, 698

I

Impeachments, beginning of, 134; of Latimer and Lyons, *ib.*; of Suffolk, 171; revival of, 295; of Bacon, 296, 297; of Buckingham, 304; of Laud, 321; of Strafford, 321; of Clarendon, 369; of Danby, 381; of Dr. Sacheverell, 456; of Bolingbroke, 465; of Warren Hastings, 578, 579
Imperial Conferences, 796
Imperial defense, 754, 891, 905–907
Imperial federation, 796, 890
Imperial War Cabinet and Conference, 903 note, 906, 907
Imperialism, British, 700; Disraeli popularizes the idea of, 701, 708, 799; Gladstone opposed to extreme, *ib.*; Victoria as the embodiment of, 725; growth of the idea of, 762–763; the problem of, 796–797, 907
Imports, British, 809–812
Impositions, 290, 322–323
Impressment, *see* Search, right of
"In and out" clause, the, 720
Incandescent lamp, the, 740
Incident, the, 324
Income tax, the, established by Pitt, 598; Peel's second Ministry revives, 668; increased by Lloyd George, 755
Indemnity and Oblivion, Act of, 361–362
Independent Labor Party, the, 749, 876
Independents, the, 255, 336, 339, 350
India, opened up by Englishmen, 272; beginnings of the English activity in, 492, 493; the struggle with the French for supremacy in, 493; triumph of the British over the French in, 502–503; mutual restoration of conquests in (1763), 509; state of, at close of Seven Years' War, 570–571; North's Regulating Act, 571; Fox's Bill for, 572–573; Pitt's Bill, 575; Napoleon strikes at, 592, 597; extension of British control in, 784–787; the Mutiny in, 787–791; Government of, transferred to the Crown, 1858, 791–792; recent history of, 792–793; the problem, 793–795; British Labor Party demands freedom for, 878, 882; in the World War, 900–901; manifestations of discontent in, 901; grievances of, 901–902; demand for Home Rule in, 902–903; the Montagu-Chelmsford Report on, 903–905; the situations in, at the close of the War, 905; *see* Anglo-Japanese treaties
India, All, Moslem League, 902, 904
Indian National Congress, 795, 902–904
Indians, American, in American Revolution, 530 note; in War of 1812, 609
Indo-European "race," 9 note
Indulgence, the Declaration of Charles II, 374; the first Declaration of James II, 392; the second, 394
Industrial and social progress in the Victorian Era, 744, 745

Industrial Revolution, the, 3, 548–553, 568
Industry, in the thirteenth century, 109; under Edward I, II, III, 138–140; in the fifteenth century, 189–190; under Elizabeth, 274–275 ; in the seventeenth century, 401–403; before the great inventions, 548–549; following the inventions, 549–553; at end of Napoleonic wars, 616–617; *laissez-faire* theory opposes state interference with, 666; war control of, 869–874; 876–879
Ine (ē'ne or ī'ne), King of the West Saxons, 29, 31
Inkerman, battle of Mount, 685
Innocent III, Pope, 78, 91–92, 96, 97
Inns, Anglo-Saxon, 50; in the Middle Ages, 145–146; in the seventeenth century, 405
Inoculation, discovery of, 536
Inquisition, the, 249–250 note
Inquisition jury, the, 77–78
Instrument of Government, the, 349–350
Insularity, importance of British, 4
Insurance against sickness and unemployment, 747–748
Intercursus Magnus, 191
Interdict, 91
Interest, forbidden, 141–142, 187; legalized under Elizabeth, 270
Interludes, 281
International Workingmen's Association, the, 749
Invasions into Britain, neolithic, 9; Celtic, 9–10; Germanic, 14, 18, 20–21; Danish, 29–31, 36–38; Norman, 40–41
Investiture, compromise on, 64
Iona, monastery of, 24
Ireland, physical characteristics, 6–7; conquest of, under Henry II, 74, 75; description of, by Giraldus, 84; laws of Edward III relating to, 157; visited by Richard II, 157–158; supports Simnel and Warbeck, 184–185; Poynings's Law imposed on, 185, 186; policy of Henry VIII toward, 218–219; movements in, against Elizabeth, 254; Essex's failure against, 262; difficulties with, under James I, 291–292; Wentworth's rule in, 315–316; rebellion of 1641 in, 324; Charles I's relations with the Roman Catholic party in, 328, 335, 336; Cromwell's conquest of, 345–346; the Restoration in, 363; policy of James II in, 391–392; landing of James in, 426; flight of James from, and William's conquest of, 427–428; the treaty of Limerick and its violation, 428; oppressive restrictions and penal laws against the Irish, *ib.*; evil conditions in, under George III, 537–538; independence of Parliament of, 538; French expedition to, in 1796, 590; conditions in, in 1782–1789, 592; effect of French Revolution in, 593–594; rebellion of 1798 in, 594–595; parliamentary union of, with England, 595–597; agitation on behalf of Roman Catholics in, 623–624; Catholic emancipation, 624–626; parliamentary franchise under Bill of 1832, 650, 653–654; the Tithe War and the Irish Church Bill, 654–656; potato famine in, 671–673, 676–677; effects of Revolution of 1848 upon, 677–678; representation of, untouched, under Act of 1867, 699; Fenian movement in, 703; Gladstone's measures in behalf of, 1869–1870, 703–705; in 1881, 713; Home Rule agitation in, 712–714; first Home Rule Bill, 716–717; "Parnellism and Crime," 717–718; split in Home Rule party, 719; the second Home Rule Bill, 720–721; the Home Rule problem, 721–722; the revival of the Home Rule struggle and the Bill of 1914, 757–760; British Labor Party demand Home Rule for, 878, 882; the Rebellion of 1916 in, 882 ff.; the problem in, 889–890
Ireton, General, 338–339, 341
Irish Agricultural Organization Society, the, 721
Irish Convention, 888–889
Irish Church, disestablishment of the, 703–704
Irish Church Temporalities Bill, the, 655–656, 748
Irish Land Acts, of 1870, the, 704–705; of 1881, 713
Irish Local Government Act, 721
Irish Nationalists, *see* Nationalist Party
Irish Nationalist Volunteers, 883–885
Irish Protestant Volunteers, 538
Irish Volunteers, 884, 886
Irish Republican Brotherhood, 883 note; party, 889
Irish Union, O'Connell agitates repeal of, 626
Iron, development of English manufacture of, 401, 551; *see also* 810
"Ironsides," Cromwell's, 330, 331, 333
Isabel of Angoulême, second wife of John, 90
Isabel of Gloucester, first wife of John, 90
Isabella of France, Queen of Edward II, 122–123, 125
Isabella, Queen of Richard II, 157
Isabella of Castile, 186, 197 note
Isle de Bourbon, *see* Bourbon
Isle de France, *see* France
Ismail, Khedive of Egypt, 780–781
Italian Opera in England, 565
Italian cities, commerce of, 546
Italy, revolutions in, 627, 631; Cavour and unification of, 688–689; in the war of 1866, 700; in the Triple Alliance, 804; in war with Turkey, 821; ambition of, 823; in the World War, 840, 845, 846, 849, 853
Itinerant justices, 66, 78, 82, 118

J

Jackson, General Andrew, 609
Jacobites, the, under William III, 427, 431, 434, 439; under George I, 446–466, 473; under George II, 476, 485
Jamaica, 351–352, 663
James I, King of England, significance of his accession, 285; early environment and character of, 285–287; his treatment of the Puritans, 287–288; of the Catholics, 288–289; conflicts with Parliament, 289–292, 295–299; financial embarrassments of, 290–292; relations with Scotland, 291; with Ireland, 291–292; conflicts with his subjects during the interparliamentary period, 292–295; his policy in the Thirty Years' War opposed to that of his subjects, 295; quarrels with the Commons over privilege, 297–298; adopts the anti-Spanish policy of the Commons, 298; arranges marriage treaty of Charles and Henrietta Maria, 299; death and estimate of, 298–299; Scotch

policy of, 314; regulation of trade and manufactures by, 401
James, Duke of York, in the second Dutch war, 367; marries Mary of Modena, 374–375; in the third Dutch war, 375; becomes a Roman Catholic, 376; his connection with the Popish Plot, 378–379; attempts to exclude from the succession, 381–382; *see* James II
James II, King of England, his character and aims, 385; first measures of, 386; vengeance of, after Monmouth's rising, 387–388; the turning point in his reign, 388; his relations with Louis XIV, *ib.*; his encroachments on the Test Act, and Ecclesiastical Commission, 388–390; his dealings with the Scots, 391; his Irish policy, 391–392; his first Declaration of Indulgence, 392; his attack on the Universities, 393; his attempt to pack a Parliament, *ib.*; his second Declaration of Indulgence, 394; birth of a son to, *ib.*; fails in suit against the Seven Bishops, 395; issues belated concessions, 396; his flight, 396–397; Parliament declares his abdication, 398; lands in Ireland, 426; flees again to France, 427; his Declaration, 431; expedition of, defeated at La Hogue, *ib.*; death of, 443
James IV, King of Scotland, 186, 195, 217
James V, King of Scotland, 217–218
James VI, King of Scotland (later James I, King of England), 254, 259 note; *see* James I, King of England
James Francis Edward, 394, 397, 460; the rising of 1715 in behalf of, 465–466
Jameson Raid, the, 775
Jane (Seymour), Queen of Henry VIII, 212, 217
Japan in the World War, 856; *see* Anglo-Japanese Treaties, Russo-Japanese War
Jay, John, 540
Jeanne d'Arc, 168–170
Jefferson, President Thomas, 608
Jeffrey, Francis, 640
Jeffreys, George, successively Chief Justice and Lord Chancellor, 387–388
Jellicoe, Admiral, 858
Jena, battle of, 602
Jenkins' Ear, the War of, 479–480
Jenner, Edward, 635–636
Jennings, Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough, 396, 445, 456; *see also* Mrs. Freeman
Jervis, Admiral Sir John (Lord St. Vincent), 590
Jesuits, the founding of the Society of, 249; in England, 254–255; *see* Popish Plot
Jews, 139, 146, 492; expulsion of, by Edward I, 120; return of, 350–351; removal of exclusion from Parliament, 688
Joffre, Marshal, 837, 838, 841
Johannesburg, 775, 778
John, King of England, opposes Henry II, 75; plots against Richard I, 81; scholarship of, 83; treatment of the weavers' gild, 86 note; constitutional importance of his reign, 89; his character, 89–90; the three crises of his reign, 90–94; concession of Magna Carta, 94; final struggles and death, 96–97
John, Duke of Bedford, 166, 168, 170
John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster, 134 and note, 135, 150
John of Salisbury, 83
John Bull, The History of, 442 note
Johnson, Dr. Samuel, 477, 560–561
Jones, Inigo, 420
Jonson, Ben, 283
Joyce, Cornet, 538
Jubilee, Victoria's, in 1887, 719, 763, 769
Judges, the conflicts of, with James I, 292–293; consultation of, by James I, 293; by Charles I, 313; three dismissed by Charles I, 312 note; tenure of, 440
Judgment by peers, 95, 96
Judicial combat, 55
Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, the, 265
"Junius, the Letters of," 522, 523
Junot, French commander, in Portugal, 604
Junto, the Whig, 439–440
Juries, introduced into England, by William I, 77; brought into general use by Henry II, 77–78; fining of, abolished, 359
Justices of the Peace, 142, 269, 275
Justiciar, the, 65
Justification by faith, 202, 213, 250
Justinian Code, 76
Jutes, the, 18, 20, 21
Jutland, battle of, 858, 859

K

Kaffirs, the, 773
Kaiser, *see* William
Kars, Russia secures, 686
Katherine of France, successively wife of Henry V and of Owen Tudor, 165, 166
Kay, John, 550
Keats, John, 638
Keble, John, 728, 729
"Keepsakes," 730
Kelvin, Lord, *see* Thomson, William
Kemble, John, 738
Kendal, Duchess of, *see* Schulenburg, Countess von
Kenilworth, 103, 275, 276
Kent, Duchess of, mother of Victoria, 662 and note; Duke of, *ib.*
Kent, the Nun of, 209
Kerensky, 848–849
Kett, Robert, rebellion of, 232
Keyes, Admiral, 862
Khartum, 783–784
Kiao Chau, 805, 807
Kidd, Captain, 553
Kielmannsegge, Countess von, 463
Kilkenny, Statute of, 157
Killiekrankie, battle of, 429 and note
Kimberley, 774
King, the Anglo-Saxon, his functions, 47; *see also* Monarchy; office of, abolished by the Rump, 344
"King of France," title, dropped by English monarch, 344
King James' version, the, 288
Kingmaker, *see* Neville, Richard
King's Bench, Court of, 78; *see* Common Law Courts
"King's evil," 473
King's Friends, the, 507, 522
King's Peace, 47
King's Primer, the, 216
Kingsley, Charles, 735–736, 749
Kipling, Rudyard, 737 note
Kirke, Colonel Percy, 387, 426, 427, 625
"Kirke's Lambs," 387
Kirk o' Field, 247
Kirk sessions, 241
Kitchener, General Herbert, Lord Kitchener, in the Boer War, 777–778; his conquest of the Sudan, 784; in the World War, 841, 866, 871 note; Kitchener's million, 844
Knights' fees, 58 and note
Knights Hospitallers, 67
Knights Templars, 67
Knox, John, 242, 247
Korea, 792 note, 807

Koweit, 819
Kruger, President, 776, 778
Kultur, German, 815–817
Kut-el-Amara, 899

L

Labor disturbances, 1911–1912, 757
Labor legislation, recent, 746, 747; in New Zealand, 771–772
Labor parties, 748; since the beginning of the World War, 876–879, 881–882
Labor problems, in the World War, 869–872, 876–879; *see* Ministries
Laborers, condition of, in the fifteenth century, 188; condition of, under Henry VIII, 224; under Elizabeth, 276; in the seventeenth century, 407–409; in the eighteenth century, 553; in the Victorian period, 744–745; statutes of, 131, 142, 153, 225
"Labor's Call to the People," 881
Lackland, *see* John, King of England
Ladies' Gallery, the, 746
Ladies-in-waiting, the royal, and party politics, 663–664
Ladysmith, 777
La Fayette, Marquis de, 533
La Hogue, battle of 431
Laissez-faire, policy of, 553, 661–662, 697–698, 749; in colonial administration, 762
Lajpat Rai, 901 note
Lake of the Woods, the, 675
"Lake School," the, 637
Lamb, Charles, 639
Lamb, Mary, 639
Lamb, William, Lord Melbourne, first Ministry of, 658; second Ministry of, 659; Victoria's instructor, 662; characterization of Ministry of, in 1837–1838, 663; conduct of, in Bedchamber Question, 663–664; difficulties of, with Victoria, over Prince Consort, 664; resignation of, 668
Lancaster, Duchy of, 662 note
Lancaster, House of, parliamentary basis of, 159; constitutional importance of its régime, 161; causes for fall of, 181
Lancaster, James, 272
Lancaster, Joseph, 706
Land Purchase Acts, the Irish, 705, 713, 715, 716 and note; *see also* Irish Land Acts
Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury, 55, 62, 89, 90
Langland, William, 149, 150, 153
Langton, Stephen, Archbishop of Canterbury, 91–92, 94, 97
Lansdowne, the Marquess of, 756, 806; *see also*, Petty, William, Earl of Shelburne
Larkin, James, 884
Latimer, William, Lord, impeachment of, 134, 135
Latimer, Hugh, Bishop of Worcester, 227, 239
Latitudinarians, the 413
Laud, William, Archbishop of Canterbury, 309–311, 321
Lauderdale, Duke of, *see* Maitland, John
Laurier, Sir Wilfrid, 767, 892
Law Courts, reorganization of, in 1873, 708
Law, John, 688
Lawlessness in Medieval England, 142, 185; in eighteenth-century England, 567
Lawrence, Sir Henry, defense of Lucknow by, 789
Lawrence, John (later Lord Lawrence), aids in suppressing the Indian Mutiny, 788, 789
Layamon, 84
Lay patronage, 730
League of Nations, 854, 878, 881
Leagues, *see* Anti-Corn Law, Catholic, Empire, Holy
Leaving certificates, 872 note
Leeds, 2, 699
Leeds, Duke of, *see* Osborne, Sir Thomas
Legislation, beginning of, under Edward I, 118
Leicester (les'ter), Earl of, *see* Dudley, Robert
Leighton (lay'ton), Alexander, 311, 321
Leinster (lĕn'ster), 74
Leipzig, battle of, 607
Lely (lē'ly), Peter, 420
Lenine, 849
Lenthall, Speaker, 325, 326
Leopold, Prince of Saxe-Coburg, later King of Belgium, 631, 664
Lesage, 740
Leslie, Alexander, Earl of Leven, 315, 333
Lesseps, Ferdinand de, 780–781
Letter from Sydney, the, 763, 769
"Letters of Junius," the, 522, 523
Lettow-Vorbeck, Colonel, 896
Leuthen, the battle of, 499
Levelers, the, 344
Lever (lē'ver), Charles, 735
Leviathan, the, 414
Lewes, battle of, 102
Lexington, battle of, 529
Libel, the law of, 438, 665
Liberal party, origin of name, 654; the, Gladstone causes breach in, 702, 717; the, social legislation of, 747; alliance of, with the Laborites and Nationalists, 749
Liberal Unionist party, birth of, 716, 717
Liber de Unitate Ecclesiæ, 212
Lichnowsky, Prince, 826, 827
Liége, 836, 837
Light Brigade, Charge of the, 685 note
Ligny, battle of, 611
Lilburne, John, 311, 321, 344–345
Limerick, the siege and treaty of, 428
Lincolnshire, rising in, 214
Lindisfarne, 25, 30
Lionel, Duke of Clarence, second son of Edward III, 159 note, 171
Lister, Joseph, Baron Lister, 739
Literature, Anglo-Saxon, 48, 49; Anglo-Norman, 60, 61; at the court of Henry II, 83–84; in the thirteenth century, 107; in the fourteenth century, 148–150; in the fifteenth century, 192; in the time of Henry VII, 227–228; in the Elizabethan age, 277–283; in the seventeenth century, 417–420; in the eighteenth century, 559, 565; in the early nineteenth century, 636–640; the Victorian, 730–737
Little Parliament, the, *see* Nominated
Liverpool, 4, 634, 692, 699
Liverpool, Lord, Prime Minister, 605, 606, 608, 609, 615, 620, 622
Livery and Maintenance, 142 and note. 153
Livery Companies, 185
Lloyd George, *see* George
Llywelyn ap Gruffydd, 112
Llywelyn ap Jowerth, 112
Loans, forced, 223, 267, 304–306
Lob-lie-by-the-fire, 408
Local government under the Tudors, 269
Local Government Act, the, 719, 721 and note
Lochleven Castle, 247
Locke, John, his political philosophy, 414; his *Letters on Toleration*, 424; assists in restoration of coinage, 434; influence of, on revolutionary preachers, 513; indebtedness of Hume to, 557
Lodge, Thomas, 279
Logarithms, invention of, 416
Lollards, 151, 164, 184, 249
London, 4; taken by the Northmen, 30; recovered by Alfred,

31; captured by William I, 53; granted a charter, *ib.*; under Henry I, 66; charters to, from Conquest to Magna Carta, 85; gilds of, 86; population of, in the fifteenth century, 189; health regulations in, 225; in the first months of the Long Parliament, 321; the Plague and Fire in, 368; treaty of (1674), 375; condition of, in the seventeenth century, 409–411; in the eighteenth century, 567–568; conference of, Belgian and Greek questions adjusted by, 630–631; conference at, Schleswig-Holstein Question before, 694; members from, 715; made a separate county, 719–720; treaty of (1913), 821–822
Londonderry, the siege of, 426–427
London Gazette, the, 438
Longbeard, *see* William Fitz-Osbert
Longbow, effectiveness of the, 126, 128, 132, 144
Longchamp, *see* William
Long Parliament, the temper and aims, 319; the leaders in, 319–320; impeachments by, 321–322; remedial legislation of, 322–323; struggle over religion and the Grand Remonstrance, 323–325; alliance with the Scots, 332; intolerance of, 337; conflict with the army, 338–340; Pride's Purge of, 341; *see* Rump; final dissolution of the, 356
Loose, 844
Lord Lieutenant, 269, 393
Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, 625, 656
Lord Protector, the, *see* Cromwell, Oliver *and* Richard, *and* Seymour, Edward
Lords Appellant, the, 156
Lords, House of, the origin of, as a separate House, 115; spiritual power weakened by dissolution of the monasteries, 215; composition of, under Henry VIII, 223 and note; the control of, by Elizabeth, 266; as a court of appeal, 268; temporarily abolished by the Rump, 344; yield right to amend money bills, 370; Country Party organized in, 376; creation of twelve new peers in, 458; a Tory stronghold under Pitt, 575; threat to create peers in, to carry Reform Bill, 652–653; Radicals call for reform of, 660; conflicts with the Commons, 690, 704, 714–715, 721, 755–756; Irish bishops excluded from, 704; as a Court of Appeal under reform of 1873, 708; decides in favor of lay patrons, 730; decisions of, in the Taff Vale and Osborne cases, 748–749; reduction of the powers of, 755–756; *see also* Witan, Great Council, Parliament, Barons, Nobility, *and* Peers
Lords of the Congregation, *see* Congregation
Lords Ordainers, 121
Lothian, cession of, 37
Lotteries, 651
Loubet, President, 806
Loughborough (luf'bŏrō), Lord, *see* Wedderburn
Louis (afterwards Louis VIII, King of France), invasion of England, 97; defeat and expulsion, 98
Louis XIV, King of France, alliance of Charles II with, 366, 372; intervenes in the first Dutch War, 367; combines with Charles II in the treaty of Dover, 374; subsidizes the Opposition, 377–380; relation of James II with 388; receives James II and his Queen, 397; aids James II, 424, 426; alliance of William III against, 430; agrees to the peace of Ryswick, 435; *see* Spanish Succession; promises to recognize the son of James II, 443; makes peace of Utrecht with England, 458–459; death of, 465
Louisburg (Cape Breton Island), 484, 489, 499
Louisiana, 510, 600
L'Ouverture, Toussaint, 600
Louvois, Minister of Louis XIV, 430
Lowestoft, battle of, 367
Lowlands, the Scottish, 6
Loyalists, American, 529, 541
Loyola, Ignatius, 249
Lucknow, siege of, 789–790
Ludendorff, General von, 847 note
Lunéville, peace of, 598
Lusitania, the, 860
Luther, Martin, 200, 201, 202
Luttrell, Colonel, 322
Luxembourg, Marshal, 430–432
Lycidas, Milton's, 418
Lyell, Sir Charles, 635
Lyly (lĭ'ly), John, 278
Lyons, Richard, 134
Lytton, Edward Bulwer, Lord Lytton, 734

M

MacArthur, John, 769
Macaulay, Thomas Babington (Baron Macaulay), 730, 731
Macedonia, 802–803, 822
Mackensen, Marshal von, 843
Mackay, General Hugh, 429 and note
Mackintosh, Sir James, 582
MacNeill, John, 886–887
Mad Parliament of Oxford, 101
Madras, *see* India
Mafeking, 778
Magdalen College, the Fellows of, 493
Magna Carta, 90; the struggle for, 92–94; significance of, 94; terms of, 95–96; means of enforcement and future importance of, 95–96; declared null and void by the Pope, 96–97; confirmations of, 103, 116–117
Magnum Concilium, *see* Great Council
Mahdi, the, 782–783
Maine, U. S. A., Ashburton adjusts boundary of, 674–675
Maintenance, *see* Livery
Maitland, John, Earl and later Duke of Lauderdale, 372, 374
Major-Generals, the rule of the, 353
Majuba Hill, the battle of, 773
Malakoff Tower, the, 686
Maldon, battle of, 36
Malmesbury, the borough of, 648
Malory, Sir Thomas, 192
Malta, captured by Napoleon, 597; recovered by England, 846; and the treaty of Amiens, 599–600; secured to Great Britain by Congress of Vienna, 612
Malthus, Thomas, 636
Mamelukes, the, Egyptian, 593 and note
Manchester, 2; cotton industry centered at, 549; massacre in, 618; railroad to Liverpool from, opened, 634–635; free trade agitation centers at, 668; representation of, under the Bill of 1867, 699; Fenian disturbance at, 703
Manchester, Earl of, *see* Montagu, Edward
"Manchester martyrs," the, 703
Manchuria, 807
Manila, 509–510
Manitoba, Province of, 766 note

Manor houses, in the fourteenth century, 147
Manors, Anglo-Saxon, 43; in Anglo-Norman times, 59–60
Mansfield expedition, the, 299
Manufactures, measures to protect, 190–191; regulations of, by James I and Charles I, 401; development of, in England before the great inventions, 548–549; status in 1832 of, 633
Maoris, the, 771
Map, Walter, 82, 84
Mar, Earl of, *see* Erskine, John
Marathas, 571, 785
Marchand, Major, 784 note
Marcher lords, the, 102, 103, 112
Marconi, 740 note
Marengo, Austria defeated at, 598
Margaret of Anjou, Queen of Henry VI, 170, 172–177
Margaret of Burgundy, 176, 185
Margaret, Queen of James IV of Scotland, 186
Marian Exile, significance of, 240–241
Marian martyrs, the, 239–240
Maritz, Colonel, 895
Markets, 86, 87
Markiewicz, Countess, 887
Marlborough, Duchess of, *see* Jennings, Sarah
Marlborough, Duke of, *see* Churchill, John
Marlowe, Christopher, 281–282
Marne, battle of the, 837; second battle, 851
Marprelate libels, the, 256–257
Marriage, feudal incident of, 58; sacrament of, 213, note
Marriage Act, Lord Hardwicke's, 491–492
Marryat, Captain, 735
Marshall, *see* William Marshall
Marshall, General, 898, 899
Marston Moor, battle of, 333–334
Martin, Richard, "Humanity Martin," 642
Mary I, Princess and Queen of England, 203, 204; accession, character, and policy of, 236–237; restores the ecclesiastical system of Henry VIII, 237; marries Philip of Spain, *ib.*; suppresses Wyatt's rebellion, *ib.*; secures reunion of Church of England with Rome, 238; the Marian persecutions, 238–240; last years and death of, 240
Mary II, Princess, later Queen of England, marries William of Orange, 376–377; chosen joint sovereign with William, 398–399; influence of, in purifying the drama, 420; her death, 432, 433
Mary (of Modena), Queen of James II, 374–375, 394, 397
Mary, Queen of Scots, birth of, 218; crowned Queen, *ib.*; taken to France, 352; married to the Dauphin (later Francis II of France), 233; returns to Scotland, 246; marries Darnley, 247; murder of Darnley, *ib.*; her marriage to Bothwell, defeat, and flight to England, 247–248; her trial and captivity, 248; rising of the Northern Earls to put her on the throne of England, *ib.*; aim of Philip II to make her Queen, 250; Babington's plot in behalf of, 251; her execution, *ib.*
Masham, Mrs., 455
Mashonaland, 774 note
Mason, James M., Confederate Commissioner to England, 691
Massachusetts, in the American Revolution, 518, 528
Massacre, the "Peterloo," 618
Matabeleland, 774 note
Mathew, Father, 745
Matilda, daughter of Henry I, 64–65; her war for the throne, 67–69; mention of, 203
Matthew Paris, 107, 114
Maude, General, 899
Mauritius, secured to Great Britain by Congress of Vienna, 613
Maynooth College, 702 and note
McAdam, John, 634
McCarthy, Justin, 719
Medicine, in fourteenth century, 146; in the seventeenth century, 416; in the eighteenth century, 556; in the nineteenth century, 636, 739
Medway, the Dutch enter the, 368
Meerut, rising at, 788
Melbourne (mel'bun), Lord, *see* Lamb, William
Melrose Abbey, 67
Menshikov, Prince, 683
Mercantilism, 190, 415–416, 558, 559
Merchant Adventurers, the, 273
Merchant gilds, 86
Merchant Seamen's League, 881
Merchants, concessions to, in Magna Carta, 95; foreign, in England, 139; in the fifteenth century, 190–191; under Henry VIII, 224
Mercia, supremacy of, 27
Mercians, the, 21
Merciless Parliament, the, 156
Meredith, George, 736
Merlin, 61
Messines salient, 848
Mesopotamian campaign, 898–900
Methodism, rise of, 557–558
Metternich, Prince, 612, 626–627
Mexico, 628, 692, 768
Middlesex election, the, 522
Milan decree, 603
Mile End, 155
Militant suffragists, 746, 880
Military and Naval Officers' Oath Bill, the, 623–624
Military Service Bill, 869, 883; Canadian, 892
Military tenures, 58, 362
Mill, John Stuart, 737, 746
Millais (mil lā'), John Everett, 743
Millenary Petition, the, 287
Millet, Constable's influence on, 641
Milton, John, 418–419, 513
Minden, the battle of, 502
Mines and collieries, acts relating to, 672; in 1872–1906, 746 and note
Minimum Wage Bill, the, 757
Ministerial responsibility, 543–545
Ministry of All the Talents, 601
Ministries, creation of new, during World War, 868
Minorca, captured by the British, 454; ceded to Great Britain, 459; captured by the French, 495; restored, 509; ceded to Spain, 541
Miquelon, Island of, 541
Miracle plays, 148
Mistress of the Robes, the, 663–664
Mobilization, Russian, 825
Mogul, the Great, 492–493, 788–790
Mohammed Ali, 903
Molasses Acts, 515, 517
Moldavia, *see* Rumania
Monarchy, rise and decline of Anglo-Saxon, 47–48; strengthened by Anglo-Normans, 171; strength of, under the Tudors, 183, 264; at the accession of James I, 285; declining respect for, under the first two Georges, 473
Monasteries, hospitality of, 66, 145; dissolution of the, 210–212, 214–216; as centers of poor relief, 225; of education, 227; *see* Monks
Monastic revival in twelfth century, 66–67; decline of, under

Henry II, 82; *see* Monks, Monasteries, *and* Cluniac reform
Monck, George, later Duke of Albemarle, 356, 357, 367
Money bills, the Lords yield right to amend, 370; to veto, 756
Money lending, *see* Interest *and* Usury
Monks, work and influence of, 25; the, as landlords, 188, 224; proceedings against, under Henry VIII, 210–212, 214–216; *see* Monasteries *and* Monastic revival
Monmouth, Duke of, *see* Scott, James
Monopolies, attitude of Elizabeth on, 262–263; under the Tudors and Stuarts, 267; attack on, 295–296 and note; grants of, by Charles I, 309; justification for, 401
Monroe Doctrine, the, 628 and note, 723, 1028
Mons, 837
Montagu (mon'ta-gu), Charles, later Earl of Halifax, 436, 440 and note
Montagu, Edward, Earl of Manchester, 321, 334
Montagu, Mrs., 567–568
Montagu-Chelmsford Report, 903–905
Montcalm, Marquis of, 500–501
Montenegro, 821
Montfort, de, *see* Simon
Montgomery, Robert, 788
Monthly assessments, 328
Montreal, British capture of, 503
Montrose, the Earl of, 335
Moore, Sir John, 604
Moore, Thomas, 639 note
Morality plays, 148
Moray, Earl of, *see* Stewart, Lord James
More, Sir Thomas, Speaker of the Commons, 197–198; character and work of, 201–202; Lord Chancellor, 204, 206; resigns, 208; arrest and execution of, 209–210; as a writer, 228
Morea, the, Ibrahim Pasha in, 629
Morkere, Earl, 39–40
Morley, Mrs., *see* Anne, Queen of England
Mornington, Lord, *see* Wellesley, Richard, Marquis of Wellesley
Morley-Minto Reforms, 902
Morocco, 806–808, 820–821
Morris, William, 743
Morse, Samuel, 740
Morte d'Arthur, Malory's, 192
Mortimer, Edmund, Earl of March, heir presumptive of Richard II, 159 note, 162, 165
Mortimer, Roger, 123, 125
Mortmain, Statute of, 119
"Morton's Fork," 185
Moscow, 607
Mummings, 148, 280
Municipal corporations, attacks on, by Charles II, and James II, 383, 393; forfeited charters restored, 396
Municipal Reform Act, the, 659
Munitions, production of, in World War, 833–834, 839–840, 867 note, 869–872 and notes; War Act, 871, 876
Municipal Reform Act, the, 659
Münster, the Bishop of, 367–368
Murray, Lord George, 485–487; General, 898
Music, 420–421, 565, 744
Mutiny Act, the, 424, 573
"My son's Ministry," 570
Mysore, 597

N

"Nabobs" in Parliament, 649
Namur, 431, 610–611, 836–837
Nana Sahib, 787, 789–790
Nankin, treaty of, 674
Nantes, the Edict of, 262; revoked, 388
Napier, John, 416
Napoleon, *see* Bonaparte
Napoleon, Louis, later Napoleon III, Palmerston approves the *coup d'état* of 1851 of, 681; ambition of, a cause of Crimean War, 682, 683; anxiety of, to end Crimean War, 686; Orsini's attempt to assassinate, 687–688; Orsini's plot stimulates to intervention in Italy, 688–689; unfriendly attitude of, to United States during Civil War, 692; attitude and policy of, in Schleswig-Holstein question, 694; in the Franco-Prussian War, 709
Naseby, battle of, 335
Nash, Richard (Beau Nash), 412
Nash, Thomas, 279–280
Natal, 772, 777–779 and note
Nation, the Irish, 677
National Debt, beginning of the, 436; at end of Napoleonic wars, 616; at end of the World War, 832 note, 875; *see* South Sea Company
National Guilds, 877
National Land League, the Irish, 713
National Registration Bill, 869
National Society, the, 706
National Volunteers, 886
Nationalist party, split in the ranks of, 719; reunion of, 721; combination with Liberals, 749; the agreement with, in 1910, 755–756; collapse of, 882; during the World War, 882 ff.; *see* Home Rule, Parnell, Redmond, *and* Sinn Fein
Nationalization of industry, 877–879, 882
Nations, *see* League of
Navarino, 629
Navigation Acts, beginning of, 140, 190, 191; Elizabethan, 273–274; of 1660, 362, 363; their effect on trade, 402; scope of, and effect of, on the American Revolution, 513–514, 516–517; repeal of, 621; suspension of, 677
Navy, beginning of English, 139–140; under Henry VII and Henry VIII, 226; under Elizabeth, 257–261; under the Commonwealth, 347; under Charles II, 367; in Dutch wars, 347–348, 367–368, 375; in Seven Years' War, 495–502; in American Revolution, 534–536, 538; in the Napoleonic wars, 587–588, 590–592, 597–599, 601, 603; in the War of 1812, 608–610; under Victoria, 741 note; in the World War, 835, 839, 854–863
Near East, *see* Austria, Balkans, Bulgaria, Germany, Great Britain, Greece, Russia, Serbia, Turkey
Neerwinden, battle of, 432
Nelson, Admiral, 590–591, 597, 599, 601
Neolithic man, in Britain, 9
Netherlands, commercial treaty with (the Great Intercourse), 191; revolt of, against Philip II, 250–251, 253–254; Elizabeth's intervention in the, 257; French aggressions in, 583–585; the kingdom of, 630; *see also* Flanders, Burgundy, Dutch War of Spanish Successions, Louis XIV, William III, Holland, Belgium, *and* Batavian Republic
Neutral goods in "Declaration of Paris," 681
Neutrals, regulations regarding, under Continental system, 602–603; in the World War, 833, 839, 855, 859–861
Neuve Chapelle, 843, 844
Neville (nĕv'il), Richard, Earl of Warwick, the kingmaker, 173–177
Newberrie, John, 272

New Brunswick, Province of, 765
Newbury, first battle of, 332; second battle of, 334
Newcastle, Dukes of, *see* Pelham-Holles *and* Clinton
Newcastle, the Earl of, 330–331
Newfoundland, 273, 766 note, fisheries of, 458, 509, 541, 767
New Learning, the, 199–202
Newman, John Henry, 728–729, 732
"New Model" army, the, 334–335; breach with Parliament, 336–337; conflicts with Parliament, and rise of democratic opinion in, 338–341, 356–357; disbanded, 362
New Netherland, 366–368
New Orleans, battle of, 609
Newsletters, 412 and note
New South Wales, 769–770
Newspapers, 412, 437–438, *see* Press
New Testament, 201, 216; *see* Bible
Newton, Sir Isaac, 416, 434
Newton Butler, battle of, 427
New York, 375, 532, 856, 891
New Zealand, 771–772, 893–894
Ney, Marshal, 611
Nicholas I, Tsar of Russia, 683, 686
Nicoll, Colonel Richard, 366
Niger Company, 774
Nightingale, Florence, 685
Nile, battle of the, 597
Nineteen Propositions, the, 326
Nixon, General Sir John, 898
Nobility, weakness of, under the Tudors, 183; condition of, in the fifteenth century, 189; in the seventeenth century, 406
Nominalists, the, 106–107
Nominated Parliament, the, 349
Nomination boroughs, 648
Nonconformists, their rise, 255; effect of the Act of Uniformity upon, 364–365; in the Revolution of 1688, 424; decline of, in eighteenth century, 556; *see* Dissenters *and* Education Bills
Non-intercourse Act, the American, 608
Non-residence of clergymen, 287, 660, 728
Non-resistance, Tory, High Church theory of, 382, 398
Nootka Sound, 583 note
Nore, mutiny at, 591
Norfolk, Dukes of, *see* Howard *and* Mowbray
Norman barons, risings of, 56, 57, 62
Norman Conquest, results of, 57
Normandy, Duchy of, 30, 38, 69, 90
North, Lord, enters the Grafton Ministry, 523; becomes Prime Minister, 525; efforts at conciliation with American Colonies, 529, 533; resignation of, 537; Irish reforms of, 538; unites with Fox to attack Shelburne, 570; Regulating Act of, 571
North, Thomas, 278
North America, voyage of Cabots to, 191; the English Colonies in, *see* Colonies; struggle of the French and English in, 493–494
North Britain Review, No. 45, 510–511
Northcliffe, Lord, 867
Northern earls, rising of the, 248
Northern Rising, the, *see* Pilgrimage of Grace
North Island, 771
Northmen, 30; first invasion of England and Ireland, *ib.*; their kingdoms and the West Saxon reconquest, 33–36; second coming of, 36–37; establish a dynasty under Cnut, 37
Northumberland, Duke of, *see* Dudley, John
Northumbrians, 21, 23–25, 27
Norton, Thomas, 281
Nottingham, Earl of, *see* Howard, Charles
Nova Scotia, 458 and note
Novel, the, rise of, 561–563; development of, in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, 639; in the Victorian period, 734–737
Noy, William, suggests ship money to Charles I, 312
Nun of Kent, the, 209
Nymwegen, the peace of, 377

O

Oates, Titus, 337–339, 382 note, 386
Oath helpers, 44–45; *see* Compurgators
Oaths, *see* Supremacy *and* Allegiance
O'Brien, William Smith, 678
Observants, the friars, 209
Occasional Conformity Act, 457; repealed, 468
O'Connell, Daniel, champions cause of Catholics, 623–624, 626; secures franchise reform in Ireland, 650; attitude of, toward English remedial legislation for Ireland, 656; names "Chartist" agitation, 667; death of, 677
O'Connor, Feargus, Chartist leader, 678
O'Donnell, Frank Hugh, 718
Offa, King of Mercia, 27, 50
Oglethorpe, James, 566
Old Age Pensions Act, 747
Oldcastle, Sir John, 164 note
Old Sarum, borough of, 648
"Oliver the Spy," 617
Oliver Twist, 666
Omdurman, 784
Ontario, Province of, 765
Opium traffic, measures for the suppression of, 795 note
Opium War, the, 673–674
Orange, *see* William
Orange Free State, 772, 777–779
Orange River Colony, 772, 779
Ordeals, 45, 55, 78
"Orders in Council," the, 603, 608, 609
Ordinances, the, of 1311, 121–122; royal, 267
Oregon boundary question, the, 674–675
Orford, Earl of, *see* Walpole, Robert *and* Horace
Orléans, siege of, 168–169
Ormonde, Duke of, *see* Butler, James
Ormonde, Marquis of, *see* Butler, James
Orsini, conspirator, 687, 688
Osborne, Sir Thomas, successively Earl of Danby, Marquis of Carmarthen, and Duke of Leeds, becomes Lord Treasurer, 375; his use of bribery, 376; his religious policy, *ib.*; fall of, 380–381; his dismissal, 544
Osborne Judgment, the, 749
O'Shea, Captain, 719
Ostend, 838, 862–863
Oswald, Northumbrian King, 25
Oswy, Northumbrian King, 25
Ottoman Empire, *see* Turkey
Oudenarde, battle of, 454
Oudh, 571–572 and notes, 579, 786–788
"Outdoor Relief," 657
Outram (oot'ram), Sir James, 790
Owen, Robert, 666–667, 748–749
Oxford, Provisions of, 101; headquarters of Charles I, 328, 330, 335; the last Parliament of Charles II at, 382
Oxford, Earl of, *see* Vere, Aubrey de, *and* Harley, Robert
Oxford Gazette, the, 438 note
Oxford Movement, the, 729–731
"Oxford Reformers," the, 200–202

Oxford, University of, not founded by Alfred the Great, 32; origin of, 84; friars at, 105; colleges at, 106; in the fourteenth century, 147; in the time of Henry VIII, 227; James II's attack on, 393

P

Pageants, 148 and note
Paine, Thomas, 531, 581–582
Painter, William, 278
Painting, in the seventeenth century, 420; in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, 565–566, 640–641; in the Victorian Age, 743–744
Palatinate, of the Rhine, *see* Frederick V
Palatinates, 54
Pale, the Irish, 157 and note, 186
Paleolithic men, 8, 9
Palestine, *see* Holy Place; campaign in, 897–898
Palladio, 420
Palmers, 145
Palmerston, Lord, foreign policy of, 673–674, 680–682, 684; first Ministry of, 685; fall of, 687–688; beginning of second Ministry of, 689–690; in sympathy with South in American Civil War, 690; in *Trent* affair, 691; attitude of, in question of Schleswig-Holstein, 693–694; characterization and death of, 694–695; opposes the Suez Canal project, 781
Panama Canal and tolls, 768; *see also* Darien
Pandulph, papal legate, 92
Pan-German movement, 817, 821
"Papal Aggression," the, 678–679
Paper Duty Repeal Bill, the, 689–690
Papineau, Louis Joseph, 764
Paradise Lost and *Paradise Regained*, *see* Milton
Pardoners, 145
Paris, siege of, 709
Paris, treaties of (1763), 509–510; (1783), 541; (1814), 610; (1815), 612; (1856), 686–687
Paris, University of, 84
Paris, *see* Matthew
Parish, the, 269
Parish priest, the, 105–106
Parish registers, 214
Parker, Sir Hyde, 599
Parker, Matthew, Archbishop of Canterbury, 246, 256
Parliament, origin of, 114; Simon de Montfort's, 102, 114–115; the Model, 115; separation into two Houses, *ib.*; declaration of 1322, 122; deposes Edward II, 123; the Good, 134–135; beginning of impeachments in, *ib.*; gains in the fourteenth century, 137–138; the Merciless, 156; deposes Richard II, 159; gains of, under Henry IV, 163; causes of weakness under the later Lancastrians, the Yorkists, and the Tudors, 181–184; resists Subsidy of 1523, 197–198; the Reformation, 207–212; *see also* Monasteries; Henry's management of, 222–223; religious test excluding from, 247; control of, by Elizabeth, 266–268; conflicts of, with James I, 285, 289–291, 292; the "Addled," 295–300; early conflicts of, with Charles I, 303–304, 306–308; the Short, 316; the Long, early work of, 319–326; struggle with Charles I for control of the kingdom, 326; its organization during the Civil War, 327–329; conflicts with the Army, 336–340; Pride's Purge of, 341; *see* the Rump; *see also* the Nominated; quarrels of Cromwell with, 348–350, 353–354; final dissolution of the Long, 356; the Convention, 356, 357, 359–362; *see* the Cavalier; gains of, under Charles II, 369–370; origin of corruption in, 376; new tests excluding Roman Catholics from (1678), 379–380; breach of James II with, 388, 389; the Convention, of William, 398–399; Scotch members admitted to, 453; corruption in, in the time of Walpole, 472; question of its supremacy over the Colonies, 512–513, 515–516; struggle over reporting of debates in, 525–526; Pitt's attempts at reform of, 577 and note; Irish admitted to, 596; Roman Catholics admitted to, 625–626; causes of reform of, in nineteenth century, 631, 645; Bentham's influence upon reform of, 645–646; abuses in, 647–651; question of privileges of members of, in Stockdale *vs.* Hansard, 665; property qualification for election to, abolished, 688; abolition of disabilities of Jews to sit in, *ib.*; open to atheists, 712; powers of the Lords reduced in, 755–756; term of, shortened to five years and payment of members restored, 755–756; in the World War, 865–882, *passim;* women admitted to, 880–881; *see* Reform Bills of 1832, 1867, 1884, 1885 *and* 1918; *see also* House of Commons *and* House of Lords
Parnell, Charles Stewart, 712–714, 717–719
Parsons, Robert, 25
Parties, political, rivalry of, checks political evils in eighteenth century, 651; *see* Cavalier, Roundhead, Court, Country, Tory, Whig, Conservative, Liberal, Radical, Young Ireland, Nationalist, Labor
Partition Treaties, the, 442
Party system, the, beginning of, 376, 543–545
Pasha, Ibrahim, 629
Paterson, William, 436, 452
Patriarcha, the, *see* Filmer
"Patriots," the, 476
Patronage, *see* Lay Patronage
Paul's Walk, 276, 411
Pauncefote (pounce'foot), Sir Julian, 768
Pauperism, 657
Payment of members, 749, 756
Peace, *see* Justices
Peace Drive, in 1916, 847
Peace Preservation Acts, *see* Ireland
Peacham's case, 293
Pearse, Padraic, 887
Peasant Revolt, the, 149, 153–155
Pecquigny, treaty of, 177
Peel, Sir Robert, made Home Secretary, 620; reforms criminal code, 643; first Ministry of, 658–659; precipitates Bedchamber crisis, 663–664; second Ministry of, begins, 668; the Bank Charter Act of, 669; furthers development of free trade, 669–670; views of, on Ashley's labor legislation of 1843–1844, 670–671; secures Corn Law repeal, 671–673; death, and estimate of work of, 673
Peele, George, 281
"Peelites," the, 673, 682, 701
Peers, judgment by, 95–96; Tudor creations, 266 and note; creations of, in 1712, 458; Pitt and creation of, 575; *see* Lords, House of, Nobles *and* Parliament
Pelham, Henry, 483, 492

Pelham-Holles, Thomas, Duke of Newcastle, character of, 476; makes his brother Prime Minister, 483; becomes Prime Minister, 492; his quandary, 494–495; makes Byng a scapegoat, 495; resigns, 496; forms his second Ministry with Pitt in control of foreign affairs, 498, 500; end of his Ministry, 509
Penal laws, under Elizabeth, 245, 255; under James I, 288–289, 295, 297; under Charles I, 302, 305; operation of, suspended for Protestant Dissenters, 425; done away with, 534, 623; *see* Declaration of Indulgence, 682
Penal servitude, 682
Penda, King of Mercia, 24, 25
Peninsular War, the, 605–606
Penn, William, 392 note
Pennine Mountains, the importance of, 2
Penny postage, 412, 665–666, 796
Penry, John, 257
Pensions, 663 note; *see* Old Age Pensions
Pensionary Parliament, the, *see* Cavalier Parliament
Pepys (peeps), Samuel, 365, 367
Perceval, Spencer, 605
Percival, Dr., 656
Percy, Henry, Earl of Northumberland, 162, 163
Percy, Sir Henry (Hotspur), 162
Percy, Thomas, Bishop of Dromore, 564
Periodical literature, 640
Perrers, Alice, 134–136
Perry, Commodore, 609
Persia, 786–787, 792–793, 808, 890 note, 899, 900 and note
Peter of Amiens, 63
Peter of Wakefield, 91–92
Peterborough, Earl of, *see* Mordaunt, Charles
Peter's Pence, 27, 208
Petition of Right, the, 306
Petitioners, the, 381
Petitions and the origin of legislation, 137, 138
Petrarch, 149
Petre (pe'ter), Father, 389
Petty, Sir William, 415
Petty, William, Earl of Shelbourne and Marquis of Lansdowne, 537, 539–540, 570
Pevensey, 40
Philip II, King of Spain, 237–240, 245, 250–251; Catholic leader, 257–259; recalls Alva, 245; plans expedition against England, 259; claim to the English throne, 259 and note; sends the Armada against England, 259–261; final struggle with Elizabeth and death, 261–262
Phillip, Captain, 769
Philosophy, in the seventeenth century, 414–415; in the eighteenth century, 557; in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, 636; in the Victorian Age, 737
Phœnix Clubs, 702
Phœnix Park murders, the, 713–714
Photography, 739
Picts, the, 11 and note
Piers the Plowman, 149–150
Pigott forgeries, the, 718
Pilgrimage of Grace, 213–214
Pilgrims and pilgrimages, 145, 213
Pilgrim's Progress, *see* Bunyan
Pillory, the, 567, 643
Pinkie, battle of, 233
Piracy, in eighteenth century, 553
Pitt, Fort (Pittsburgh), 499
Pitt, William (later Earl of Chatham), the beginning of the political career of, 490; opposition of, to Newcastle, 495; made Secretary of State, 496; estimate of, 496–497; his "system," 497–498; his dismissal and recall as Secretary in the second Newcastle Ministry, 498; his conduct of the campaigns of 1757–1760, 498–504; anti-party attitude of, and effect of victories, 506; his resignation, 508; distinction of, between taxation and regulation of trade, 515; his opposition to the Stamp Act, 519–520; forms the Grafton-Pitt Ministry, 520; becomes Earl of Chatham, *ib.*; his illness and retirement, 521; attacks the Grafton Ministry, 523; opposes British Colonial policy and proposes conciliation, 529; views of, regarding American Colonies in 1778, 533; death of, 534; advocates parliamentary reform, 646
Pitt, William, the Younger, struggle of, with the Coalition, 573–574; sketch of career of, 574–575; India Bill of, 575; his financial reforms, 576–577; his political strength and achievements, 577–578; attitude of, in Hastings's impeachment, 578–579; thwarts Fox on Regency question, 579–580; attitude towards French Revolution, 581; foreign policy of, 582–583; in the war with France, during the First Coalition, 583, 585, 588–590; his Irish policy, 593, 595, 596, resignation of, 596–597; organizes Second Coalition against France, 597; second Ministry and death, 601; advocates parliamentary reform, 646; Quebec Government Bill of, 763
Place Bills, 441 and note, 650, 866 note
Plague, the, 146, 225, 568; *see also* Black Death
Plantagenet (plantaj'enet) dynasty, the, beginning of, 71 and note; end of, 159–160
Plassey, the battle of, 503
Platonists, the Cambridge, 413–414
Plautius, Aulus, 12
Plautus, 281
Plunkett, Sir Horace, 721, 888
Plural voting, 699 and note, 757, 881
Pluralities, 287, 660, 728
Pocket boroughs, 648
Poet laureate, 732
Poetry, Anglo-Saxon, 48; Anglo-Norman, 60–61; in the Middle Ages, 107, 149–150, 192, Henrician, 228; Elizabethan, 278–280; in the seventeenth century, 417–419; in the eighteenth century, 563–564; Romantic, Victorian, 636–638
Poison gas, *see* Gas
Poitiers, 132
Poitou, 90, 92, 93
Pole, Reginald, later Archbishop of Canterbury, 212, 238–240
Pole, Michael de la, created Earl of Suffolk, 156
Pope, William de la, Duke of Suffolk, 170–171
Political Register, Cobbett's, 618 and note
Poll taxes, 153
Polo, Marco, 768
Pondicherry, 493, 503
Pontiac, the conspiracy of, 515
Poonah, the Peshwa of, 581, 787
Poor Laws, the, of Henry VIII, 225–226; of Elizabeth, 275; the New (1834), 657–658, 666, 741
Poor preachers, Wiclif's, 151
Pope, Alexander, 563–564, 636
Popish Plot, the, 368–369, 377–380
Population, of England, in the Anglo-Norman period, 60; in the fifteenth century, 189; increase of, under Henry VII and Henry VIII, 224 and note;

in the Restoration period, 407; growth of, in the eighteenth century, 566; decrease of, in Ireland, 721; increase of, in the United Kingdom and in England and Wales in the nineteenth century, 1, 744; of the British Empire, 1, 761
Port Jackson, 769
Porte, the Sublime, *see* Turkey
Portland, Earl of, *see* Bentinck, William
Portland, Duke of, *see* Bentinck, William Henry
Porto Bello, 480
Portugal, marriage alliance of Charles II with, 366; as a maritime power, 493, 547; in the Peninsular War, 603–606; loses Brazil, 627–628
Portuguese West Africa, 774, 805
Positivism, 737 and note
Potato famine, the, 671, 676, 721
Pottery manufacture, 750–751
Poundage, *see* Tonnage
Poynings' Law, 185–186
Præmunire (pre'mu nire), Statute of, 131 and note; employed against Wolsey, 204; invoked by Henry VIII against the clergy, 208
Pragmatic Sanction, 480 and note, 483, 484, 489
Prague, peace of, 700
Praise of Folly, *see* Erasmus
Prayer Book, *see* Common Prayer
Preferential trade, 753, 809
Preraphaelites, the, 733 note, 743, 744
Prerogative, the royal, magnified by the High Church party, 302
Presbyterians, organization of, 241–242; aims of, under Elizabeth, 256; religious and political theories of, 287–288; relations of, with James I, 291; effort of, to capture the Established Church of England, 323; *see* Solemn League and Covenant, *and* Westminster Assembly; breach of, with the Independents, 333–334; lose ground in England, 365; establishment of, guaranteed in the union, 453; Irish, Gladstone's treatment of, in 1869, *see* United *and* Free Church
Presentment jury, 77, 78
Press, the censorship of the, 310–311; end of the censorship of, 437–438; in struggle over reporting debates, 525–526; progress of, as a political factor, under George III, 526; influence of, in Crimean War, 685; in the World War, 867
Pressburg, peace of, 601
Pressing to death, 567
Preston, battle of, 341; Jacobite surrender at, 466
Prestonpans, the battle of, 485
Pretenders, *see* James Francis Edward, Charles Edward, Simnel, *and* Warbeck
Pretoria, 778–779
Price, Dr. Richard, 577
Pride's Purge, 341
Priest, *see* Parish
Priestley, Joseph, 555
Prime Minister, first use of the name, 476, 481; rise of, 543–545; in World War, 867–868
Primer, the King's, 331
Primogeniture, 85
Prince Edward Island, 766 note; *see also* Louisburg
Printing, introduction into England, 192
Prisons, in the Middle Ages, 142–143; efforts of Oglethorpe and Howard to reform, 566–567; improvement of, in the nineteenth century, 745–746
Privateering, abolition of, in "Declaration of Paris," 687
Privateers, American, during Revolution, 534; British, in American Civil War, 691–692
Privilege, *see* Parliament
Privy Council, the, under the Tudors, 266–268; in relation to Colonial affairs, 516 note; Cabinet evolved from, 544; Judicial Committee of the, 265 and note
Probate, Court of, 708
Proclamations, royal, 293
Profiteering during the World War, 870 and note, 874, 875, 876
Progresses, royal, 275
Prohibitions, 293
Prose writers, *see* Literature
Protection, 669–670, 671–673, 682; *see* Chamberlain, Joseph; Corn Laws, Gladstone, Huskisson, Mercantilism, Peel, *and* Adam Smith
Protectorate, the, 553–557
Protectorates, British, 776, 774, 897
Protestant extremists, under Edward VI, 230–235; under Elizabeth, 255–257; *see* Baptists, Brownists, Congregationalists, Dissenters, Fifth Monarchy Men, Independents, Presbyterians, Puritans, Quakers, Nonconformists
Protestant Association, 535
Protestant flail, the, 379
Protestant Union, the, 295
Protestation, the, of the Commons, 298
Provisions of Oxford, the, 101–103
Provisions of Westminster, the, 102–103
Provisors, Statute of, 131 and note
Prussia, becomes a power of the first rank, 489; joins Triple Alliance of 1781, 583; joins armed neutrality of 1800, 598; signs Holy and Quadruple Alliances, 612–613; signs treaty of Paris after Crimean War, 686–687; *see* Frederick II (the Great), King of; *see* Wars of Austrian Succession, Seven Years' War, French *and* Napoleonic wars, Schleswig-Holstein, Austro-Prussian *and* Franco-Prussian Wars, Germany
Prynne, William, 311–321
Public debt, the, in Pitt's Ministry, 576–577; *see* National debt *and* Sinking Fund
Public works for Ireland, 676
Punishments, 142–143, 567, 643
Punjab, the annexation of, 786
Purcell, Henry, 421
Puritans, the origin of, 255; demands of, at the accession of James I, 287; their views and aims in the time of Charles I, 301–302; their moral and religious discontent, 293, 309–311; moral influence of, 355; hostility of, to the stage, 419
Puritan revolution, the, 151; causes of, 285; results of, 342, 357
Purveyance, 290
Pym, John, 316, 319–320, 322–323; attempted arrest of, 323; arranges the Solemn League and Covenant, 332; his death, *ib.*
Pyramids, battle of the, 397
"Pyrenees, There are no more," 442 and note
Pytheas of Marseilles, 10 note

Q

"Q" boats, 862
Quadrivium, 85
Quadruple Alliance, 613
Quakers, the, 365, 386 and note, 425, 492
Quarter Sessions, 268
Quartering Acts, 515, 528
Quarterly Review, the, 640

Quatre Bras, battle of, 611
Quebec, the siege and capture of, 500–501; the Province of, 765
Quebec Act, the, 528, 763
Quebec Government Bill, the, 763
Quebec Ordinances, the, 764–765
Queen's Bench, Court of, 708
Queensland, 770
Quia Emptores, 120–121
Quiberon Bay, battle at, 733
Quinquennial Bill of, 1911, 866 note
Quiros, De, 768
Quo Warranto, writs of, 383

R

Rack-renting, Irish, 624
Radicals, the, in the Whig party, 616–618; agitate for parliamentary reform, 646; oppose New Poor Law of 1834, 658; claims of, under Melbourne's second Ministry, 660, 663; Chartism embodies aims of, 667; oppose Civil Lists of Victoria and Edward VII, 662, 753
Raglan, Lord, 685
Railroads, development of, 634–635; in the Victorian Age, 740–741; government ownership of, in Australia, 770; in New Zealand, 771; Government control of, in World War, 869–870; Labor party demands nationalization of, 878, 882; *see* Steam engine
Railway strike, the, 757
Rainsborough, Colonel, 339
Raleigh, Sir Walter, 244, 261, 273, 294 note, 416
Ralph Roister Doister, 281
Ramillies, the battle of, 451
Ranulf Flambard, 62, 64
Rates, compulsory Church, abolition of, 660 note
Rates, the poor, burden of, 657, 741
Rating franchise, 659, 699
Rationing, *see* Food control
Rawlinson, General, 853
Raymond, George, 272
Reade, Charles, 736
Real Presence, the, *see* Transubstantiation
Realists, the, 106
Recognition juries, 78
Reconstruction, 868, 878–879
Recruiting in the World War, 869, 883, 884
Recusants, measures against, 255; under James I, 289, 299; *see* Penal Laws
Redan, the, 686
Redmond, John, succeeds to Parnell's leadership, 719; becomes leader of the reunited Nationalists, 721; and the Home Rule Bill of 1914, 760, 882–883, 888; activity in recruiting, 883, 885; denounces Rebellion, 888
Reeve, the Anglo-Saxon, 63, 65
Reflections on the French Revolution, Burke's, 581
Reform Bill, of 1832, 651–654; its effect on the Church, 728; of 1867, 697–700; of 1884–1885, 714–715; of 1918, 880–881
Reform of the Calendar, *see* Calendar
Reformation, the, in England, causes for, 198–199, 202; some results of, 207; effect of, on poor relief, 225; principles of, in England, Germany, and Scotland contrasted, 241
Reformation Parliament, the, 207–212
Regency Bill, the, 579–580
Regicides, the, 361
Regium Donum, 704
"Reign of Terror," the, 588–589
Relief, feudal incident of, 58
Religion, of the Celts, 10–11; in thirteenth century, 106; in the eighteenth century, 556–558; in the nineteenth century, 727–730
Renascence, the, 149, 199–200; in England, 200–202; influence of, on English literature, 277
Representation, inequalities in, in House of Commons, 647–648; after Reform Bill of 1832, 696; *see* American Revolution and virtual representation
Responsibility of Ministers, 543–545
Restoration, causes and nature of, 357
Restoration of the coinage, *see* Coinage, 46–47
Revenues, Anglo-Saxon, 46–47; Anglo-Norman, 59; under Henry II, 78–79; under Henry VIII, 223–224; under the Tudors, 267–268; of the royalist and parliamentary parties in the Civil War, 528–529; settlement of, at the Restoration, 382; the, of James II, 386; settlement of, under William III, 425–426; during the World War, 875; *see* Civil List
Revenue officers deprived of right to vote, 537
Revolution of 1688, the nature and results of, 399; *see* American Revolution
Revolution, Belgian, of 1830, 630–631
Revolution, the French, effect of Hobbes on, 415; effect of Deists on, 556; outbreak of, reception of, in England, 580–582; governments of, 581 and note; English societies to spread doctrines of, 583; aggressions of leaders of, 584–585; Reign of Terror of, 588–589; effect in Ireland of, 593; attitude of English poets toward, 637; social effects of, 641; Bentham's fear of, 645; decline of fear of, *ib.*; of 1830, 630; spread of movement of 1830, 630–631; stimulates reform in England, 631
Revolution, Greek, 628–630; Spanish, of 1820, 627–628
Revolution, European, of 1848, 677
Revolution Society, the English, 581–583
Reynolds, Sir Joshua, 565
Rhé, the expedition to, 304–305
Rhodes, Cecil, 774–776
Rhodesia, 774 and note
Rhondda, Lord, 874
Rhuddlan, Statute of, 112
Richard I (Cœur de Lion), King of England, revolt against Henry II, 75; accession and character, 80; participation in the Third Crusade, 80–81; return and imprisonment in the German Empire, 81; his ransom and visit to England, *ib.*; departure for France and death, 81–82; growth of boroughs under, 85
Richard II, King of England, navigation laws under, 140; accession, 153; attitude toward the Peasant Revolt, 154–155; the reign of, 155–159; visits Ireland, 157, 158; deposition of, 159; death and final estimate of, 159–160
Richard, Duke of Gloucester, makes himself Protector, 179; character and policy, *ib.*; proclaimed King, *ib.*; *see* Richard III
Richard III, King of England, crimes and vain efforts to secure popularity, 179–180; defeat and death at Bosworth, 180–181
Richard, Duke of York, 170–173

Richard, son of Edward IV, 178–180, 185
Richard de Clare ("Strongbow"), Earl of Pembroke, 74–75
Richard Fitzneal, 83
Richardson, Samuel, 562
Richelieu, Cardinal, 299
Ridley, Nicholas, Bishop of London, 239
Ridolfi plot, the, 251
Rights, Bill of, *see* Bill
Right, the Declaration of, 398; *see* Bill of Rights
Rights of Man, Paine's pamphlet, 581–582
Riot Act, the, 464–465
Ripon, negotiations with the Scots at, 317
Rising of 1715, the, 465–466; of 1745, 484–487
Ritualism, 729–730
River systems, 3, 4
Rizzio, David, 247
Roads, Roman, 15; in the fourteenth century, 144; in the fifteenth century, 188; in the seventeenth century, 404; in the early nineteenth century, 634; in Scotland, 48
Robert (Curthose), Duke of Normandy, 57, 62–64 and note
Robert, Earl of Gloucester, 67–69
Robert of Jumièges, 38, 39
Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln, 99
Roberts, General (Marshal, Earl Roberts), opposes Home Rule Bill, 759; in the Boer War, 777–778; in the Afghan War, 792; advocates compulsory training, 813, 815, 865
Robespierre, 589
Robin Hood, 149
Rochambeau, Count, 536
Rochdale, 748
Rochester, Earls of, *see* Wilmot, John
Rochester, Viscount, *see* Carr, Robert
"Rocket," the, Stephenson's locomotive, 894
Rockingham, the Marquis of, 519–520, 537, 539–540
Rodney, Admiral, 501, 536, 538
Roger of Salisbury, 65, 68
Roi Pacificateur, Le, 808
Rollo, 38
Roman Catholicism, contrasted with Calvinism, 241; Puritan fears of, 311; *see* Charles II *and* James II
Roman Catholics, excluded from the House of Commons, 249; Elizabeth's further measures against, 255; treatment of, by James I, 289; the party of, fostered by Henrietta Maria, 311; mostly on the side of Charles I, 328; Charles I's intrigues with, in Ireland, 328, 335–336; the condition of, under Cromwell, 350; Charles II's attempts to reintroduce, 362, 372–374; the Test Act against, 374; *see* the Popish Plot; excluded from Parliament (1678), 379–380; admitted to office by James II, 389–390; progress of, in Scotland, 391; indulgence granted to, 392–394; fanaticism against, in England, in 1780, 534–535; disabilities of, before the Relief Acts, 623; emancipation of, 623–626; status of, at Victoria's accession, 661; Russell's legislation against, 679; *see* Ecclesiastical Titles Bill *and* Accession Declaration Act
Roman Catholics, Irish, penal laws against the, 428; condition of, 1782, 537–538; concessions to, 538, 592–594; failure of, to secure concessions after the Union, 595–597; proportion of, in Ulster, 758 note
Roman fortifications in Britain, 13 note
Roman Law, 76
Roman roads, 15
Romans, their occupation of Britain, 12–16
Romantic movement, the, in literature, 564, 636–637
Romilly, Sir Samuel, 643
Romney, George, 565, 566
Rood of Boxley, *see* Boxley
Rooke, Sir George, 450
Root and Branch party, the, 323
Roses, *see* War of the
Rossbach, the battle of, 499
Rossetti, Dante Gabriel, 734 note, 743–744
Rothschild, Baron, 975
Rotten boroughs, 648, 653
Roundheads, the, 325, 544
Rouse's Point, 675
Royal African Company, the, 402
Royal Marriage Act, 526
Royal Society, the, 416
Royal title, the, changes in, 453, 596, 753 and note, 792
Rubens, 611
Rumania, 822, 847, 850
Rump Parliament, the, 341; abolishes the kingship and the House of Lords, 345; refuses to dissolve, *ib.*; dissolved by Cromwell, 348, 349; recalled and finally dissolved, 356
Runnymede, 94
Rupert, Prince, 329, and note, 333, 347, 367, 375
Ruskin, John, 732, 743
Russell, Edward (later Earl of Orford), 431
Russell, John, Lord, carries repeal of Test and Corporation Acts, 624; identifies parliamentary reform with Whigs, 646; introduces Reform Bill, 651; becomes an advocate of free trade, 671–672; first Ministry of, 676; religious problems of first Ministry of, 678–679; criticizes Palmerston's independent tendencies, 681; dismisses Palmerston, *ib.*; fall of first Ministry of, *ib.*; in Coalition Ministry, 682; retires, 685; in sympathy with South in American Civil War, 690; hasty policy of, in *Trent* affair, 691; favors intervention in behalf of Danes, 694; second Ministry of, 697; Reform Bills of, 697–698; fall of second Ministry, and death of, 698 and note; *see* Alabama Claims
Russell, Sir William Howard, correspondent of *Times* during Crimean War, 685
Russia, opening up of, in the sixteenth century, 271; *see* Wars of Austrian Succession *and* Seven Years' War; joins the armed neutrality of 1778, 535; Pitt's failure to check the expansion of, 583; in war of First Coalition, 588; in Second Coalition against France, 597; armed neutrality of 1800 organized by Tsar of, 597–598; Alexander I becomes Tsar of, 599; joins Third Coalition against France, 601; alliance with Napoleon, 602; Napoleon's campaign in, 606–607; combines against Napoleon, 607–608; in Holy and Quadruple Alliances, 612–613; favors intervention, 626–627; attitude of, toward Greek struggle for independence, 629–630; concession of, on American boundary, 675; in the Crimean War, 682–687; Napoleon III proposes mediation in American Civil War by England, France, and, 692; England isolated by Palmerston from, 694; brings her ships again into the Black

Sea, 710; advances of, in Afghanistan, 786, 792; Anglo-Japanese treaties against, 792 note; British agreement with, 793, 808; distrusts British democracy, 800; in League of Three Emperors, 800–801; in Russio-Turkish War, 801–804; Kaiser draws away from, 805; in Russo-Japanese War, 807; changed British attitude toward, 818–819, 820 note; and the Balkan problem, 820–823; in the negotiations preceding the World War, 824–827; in the World War, in 1914, 839; in 1915, 840, 845; in 1916, 846–847; the collapse of, 848–849, 867
Russia Company, the, 413
Ruyter, Admiral de, 367–368
Ryswick, the peace of, 435

S

Sabbath, better observance of, 641
Sacheverell, Dr. Henry, 455–456
Sackville, Lord George, 502
Sackville, Thomas, Lord Buckhurst, 281
Sacraments, definition of, 213 note
Sadowa, battle of, *see* Königgratz
St. Albans, 114; battle of, 172–173; second battle of, 174
St. Albans, Viscount, *see* Bacon, Sir Francis
St. Bartholomew, massacre of, 253
St. Benedict, 26
St. Brice's Day, massacre of, 36
St. Dominic, 105
St. Francis, *see* Francis
St. Giles' Cathedral, the riot in, 314
St. Helena, Napoleon at, 612
St. John (sĭn jŏn), Henry, later Viscount Bolingbroke, character of, 456; his peace negotiations with France, 457; rivalry with Oxford, 460–461; failure of his succession schemes, 461; enters the service of the Pretender, 465; aims to stop the rising of 1715, *ib.*; dismissed by the Old Pretender, 466; his activity in opposition, 476; end of his political career, 478
St. Paul, 15
St. Paul's Cathedral, 276, 309, 411; *see* Paul's Walk
St. Peter, 15
St. Peter's Fields, 618
St. Pierre, Island of, 541
St. Thomas, *see* Becket
Saladin, 79
Salian Franks, law of, 126
Salisbury, Marquis of, *see* Cecil
Salisbury oath, the, 82
Salonika, 801, 843
Sancroft, William, Archbishop of Canterbury, 394–395
San Domingo, revolt in, 600
Sanitation, 146, 225
San Jacinto, the, 691
San Stefano, the treaty of, 802
Saratoga, surrender of Burgoyne at, 532
Sarum, *see* Old Sarum
Saskatchewan, Province of, 766 note
Sati, *see* Suttee
Saunders (sän'ders), Admiral, 500
Savery, Thomas, 552
Savile (săv'il), George, Marquis of Halifax, 382
Saxons, invasions of Britain by, 13–14, 20–21
Scapa Flow, 855, 857, 863
Scheldt, French open, to navigation, 584
Schism Act, 460; repealed, 468
Schleswig-Holstein, 692–694, 700, 808 note
Scholasticism, 106, 227
Scholemaster, The, 227
Schomberg, Count, 427
Schools, 147, 226, 235, 705–707; *see* Chantry *and* Grammar
Schulenburg, Countess von, 463
Science, in the twelfth century, 83; in the Elizabethan Age, 277; in the seventeenth century, 416–417; in the eighteenth century, 555–556; in the early nineteenth century, 635–636; in the Victorian Age, 737–740
Scone (scoon), coronation stone of, 113
Scotch-Irish Church, the, 15, 25
Scotland, physical features, 5, 6; *see* Scots; wars with Edward I, 112–114; alliance with France, *ib.*; rising of Wallace, 116–117; rising of Bruce and last campaign of Edward I against, 117–118; repulse of Edward II at Bannockburn by, 122; disputed succession in, 126; expedition against, by Edward III, *ib.*; in time of Henry IV, 161–163; supports Warbeck, 185; James IV, King of, marries Margaret of England, 186; invasion from, repulsed at Flodden, 195; designs of Henry VIII on, 217–218; impolicy of Seymour toward, 232–233; the Reformation in, 241–242, 246; conflicts between Mary and the Protestant lords, 246–248; attempted Catholic revival in, 254; condition of, at the accession of the Stuarts, 285–286; relations with, under James I, 291; the first Bishops' War, 314–315; the second Bishops' War, 317; Montrose in, 328, 335; the Solemn League and Covenant arranged with, 332; troops from, surrender the King, 336, 337; "Engagers from," invade England, 340, 341; conquest of, by Cromwell, 346, 347; defeat of invaders from, at Worcester, 347; the Restoration in, 356, 363; landing of Argyle in, 386; the situation in, under Charles II and James II, 390–391; the Revolution in, 429; the massacre of Glencoe in, 429–430; union of, with England, 451–453; rising of 1715 in, 465–466; the rising of '45 in, 484–487; the transformation of, in the eighteenth century, 487–489; parliamentary franchise in, before first Reform Bill, 650; under bill of 1832, 653; representation of, under Act of 1867, 699; visits of Victoria to, 724; secessions from the Church of, 730
Scots, homages, 33, 113; invasion of Britain, 14; union of, and Picts, 33 note; early invasions of England, 53, 68
Scott, James, Duke of Monmouth, 382, 386–387
Scott, Sir Percy, 865
Scott, Sir Walter, 485 note, 637–639, 728, 730, 732; his literary work, 897, 899
Scrope, Richard, Archbishop of York, 163
Scutage, 79
Scutari, hospitals at, 685
Seamen, Elizabethan, their achievements, 257–259, 271–273
Sea power, rise of the Elizabethan, 271–273; in the eighteenth century, 538–539, 546–547; in War of 1812, 609, German rivalry in, 809–815
Search, the right of, as a cause of the War of Jenkins' Ear, 478–479; of the War of 1812, 608–609; given up, by Great Britain, 610; *see also*, 859–860
Sebastopol, siege of, 684–686
Secretary of State, the, 267

Secretary of State for India, the institution of, 791
Secretary for War, 686, 754
Sedan, the battle of, 709
Sedgemoor, battle of, 387
Seditious writings, royal proclamation against, 583
Seditious Meetings Bill, the, 589; passage of a new, 617
Seely, Colonel, 759–760
Self-denying ordinance, the, 334–335
Selling, William, 200
Seminary priests, 254 note
Seneca, 281
Senlac, battle of, 40–41
Sennussi, 897
Separatists, 255
Sepoys, 789
Septennial Act, the, 466–467, 660
Serajevo, 823
Serbia, in Russo-Turkish War, 801–802; in Balkan War, 821–822; events in, leading to World War, 823–827; in the War, 843, 853
Serf, the Anglo-Saxon, 43
Serfdom, 155
Settlement, the Act of, 440–441; the law of, 657–658
Seven Bishops, the Case of the, 394–395
Seven Years' War, the, issues in, 492; chief events in, 492–504, 508–510; effect of, in precipitating the American Revolution, 514–515
Severus, Septimius, Roman Emperor, 13 note
Seymour, Edward, Earl of Hertford, becomes Protector and Duke of Somerset, 230; his rule, 230–233; his fall, 233; execution of, 234
Seymour, Jane, Queen of Henry VIII, 212, 217
Seymour, Thomas, Lord High Admiral, 233
Shaftesbury, Earls of, *see* Cooper
Shakespeare, William, 94 note, 184 note, 279–280; his writings, 282
Shanghai, opened to British trade, 674
Sharp, James, Archbishop of St. Andrew's, 391
Sheep raising, 155, 187, 270–271; in Australia, 769
Shelley, Percy Bysshe, 638
Shells, *see* Munitions
Sheppard, Jack, 567
Sheridan, Richard Brinsley, 565, 599
Sheriff, the, or shire-reeve, Anglo-Saxon, 46; at the Exchequer, 66; decline of, under the Tudors, 269
Sheriff Muir, the battle of, 466
Sheriff's "aid," the, 72
"Shining armor," 809, 820, 826
Ship money, 312–314; declared illegal, 323
Shipping laws, relating to, 139–140; in the fifteenth century, 190–191; increase of, under Huskisson's reforms, 622; status in 1830, 633–634; development of, in Victorian period, 740–741; in comparison with German, 809–812; control of, during World War, 869, 872–873
Shires, 31, 32, 45, 46; *see* County
Shirley, Sir Thomas, case of, 289
Shop stewards, 877
Shorthouse, Joseph Henry, 737 note
Short Parliament, the, 316
Shovel, Sir Cloudesley, 450
Shrewsbury, Earl of, *see* Talbot, Charles
Shrines, 145; destruction of, 215
Siddons, Mrs., 565
Sidmouth, Lord, *see* Addington
Sidney, Sir Philip, 278–279
Sikh Wars, the, 786
Silesian Wars, the first and second, 481, 483–484; the third, 495–496, 499–502, 503–504, 509–510
Silk manufacture, the, in the seventeenth century, 401
Simnel, Lambert, 184–185
Simon de Montfort, 100–103; Parliament of, 102, 114–115
Simpson, Sir James, discoverer of chloroform, 739
Sind, annexation of, 786
"Singeing the King of Spain's beard," 259
Sinking Fund, the beginning of the, 468–469; Pitt's, 577
Sinn Fein (shin fāne), 882–890, *passim*; meaning of name, 883; in Australia, 894
Sinope, Russians attack Turkish fleet at, 684
Six Articles, the, 216–217; repealed, 231
Skager Rak, *see* Jutland
Skeffington, Francis Sheehy, 887 note
Slave trade, Anglo-Saxon, 51; abolition of African, 578
Slavery, 59 note; abolition of, in the British colonies, 656, 772; *see* American Civil War
Slidell, Confederate commissioner, 691
Small Holdings Acts, 743
Smith, Adam, 416, 558–559, 636, 737
Smith, Sidney, 640
Smollett, Tobias, 562–563
Smuts, General, in the World War, 868, 894–896, 907
Smuggling, 477–479, 514–517, 567, 576; in postal service, English traders promote, with China, 674
Soap Company, the, 309
Social classes, in the seventeenth century, 405–406; in the Victorian period, 745
Social Compact, the, 414 and note
Social Democratic party, the, 749–750
Socialism, 617, 666–667, 749–750; *see* Labor party
Society, *see* Revolutionary society
Society, the British and Foreign School, 706
Society, the National, 706
Society, Royal, for Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, 642
Society for the Improvement of Prison Discipline, the, 745
Society, London Correspondence, 583
Society of Friends of the People, the, 583
Society of Jesus, *see* Jesuits
Solebay, *see* Lowestoft *and* Southwold Bay
Solemn League and Covenant, *see* Covenant
Solway Moss, battle of, 218
Somers, John (later Lord), 434, 439–440
Somerset, Dukes of, *see* Seymour
Somerset, Earl of, *see* Carr, Robert
Somme, first, second, and third battles of the, 845–846, 847–848, 852
Sophia, Electress of Hanover, 440, 463
South Africa, the British in, 772–780; the union of, 778–779; military system of, 891; in the World War, 894–896
South African Republic, *see* the Transvaal
South American Republics, the, Canning and the recognition of, 627–628
South Australia, 765
South Island, 771
South Saxons, the, invasion of Britain, 20, 21
South Sea Bubble, the, *see* South Sea Company
South Sea Company, the, 468–471

Southwold Bay, the battle of, 375
Soviets, 849, 876, 877
Spain, war of England with, 133; matrimonial alliance with Henry VII, 186; *see* Philip II, aggressions of Elizabethan seamen against, 257–262; *see* Armada; marriage negotiations with, under James I, 294–295, 298–299; Cromwell's war with, 351–352; in the war of the Spanish Succession, 441–443, 447, 450, 454–455; *see* Utrecht, peace of; helps to defeat the Darien project, 452; *see* Jenkins' Ear, the War of, *see* Aix-la-Chapelle, the peace of (1748); joins France in the Seven Years' War, 508–509; *see* Paris, the peace of; joins France against England, 534; joins the armed neutrality of, 1780, 535; concludes peace with England, 541; antagonism between England and, in 1789–1790, 583 note; joins First Coalition against France, 1793, 588; cedes Louisiana to France, 599; signs peace of Amiens, *ib.*; Peninsular War in, 603–606; Spanish-American colonies of, declare independence, 622; revolutions, 626–628; sends expedition to Mexico in 1860, 692; *see* Morocco
Spanish Succession, War of the, 441–443, 446–452, 453–459
Speakers of the House of Commons to decide on Money Bills, 756
Spee, Admiral von, 856
Speech, freedom of, 398
Spencer, Herbert, 737, 738 note
Spencer, Robert, Earl of Sunderland, 389, 396, note, 438
Spenser, Edmund, 280
Spinning jenny, 550; mule, *ib.*
Spithead, mutiny at, 591
Sports, the Declaration of, 310
Spurs, battle of the, 195
Stafford, Lord William, 380
Stage coaches, 404, 634
Stair, Earl of, *see* Dalrymple, John
Stair, the Master of, *see* Dalrymple
Stamford Bridge, battle of, 40
Stamp Act, the, 517–518
Standing army, nucleus of the, 562; increased by James II, 388; at the outbreak of the World War, 835; *see* Mutiny Bill
Stanhope, James, first Earl Stanhope, 468, 470
Stanhope, Philip Dormer, Earl of Chesterfield, *Letters to His Son*, 563
Stanley, Edward George, Lord Stanley and fourteenth Earl of Derby, Irish Secretary, 655; Colonial Secretary, 656; first Ministry of, 682; second Ministry of, 688; third Ministry of, 698–700; resignation and death of, 700
Staple towns, 139
Star Chamber, Court of, 185, 267–268, 323
Steamboats, 634, 740–741
Steam engine, the, 551–552
Steam railways, 634, 740–741
Steele, Sir Richard, 559–560
Steelyard, the, 87 note
Steenkirke, battle of, 431
Stephen, King of England, character and problems, 67–68; attack on the Salisburys, 68; involved in Civil War, 68–69; results of his rule, 69–70; extension of Church courts under, 72
Stephenson, George, develops steam transportation, 634–635
Sterne, Laurence, 563
Steuben, Baron, 532
Stevenson, Robert Louis, 736–737
Stewart, Esmé, 254
Stewart, Henry, Lord Darnley, 247
Stewart, Lord James, later Earl of Moray, 247 and note, 251
Stigand, Archbishop of Canterbury, 39
Stirling Bridge, battle of, 116
"Stockdale and Darlington," *see* Steam railways
Stockdale *vs.* Hansard, 665
Stonehenge, 11
Stourbridge Fair, 108
Stow, John, 280
Strafford, Earl of, *see* Wentworth, Sir Thomas
Stratford de Redcliffe, Lord, 683
Strikes, 549; use of, by British trades unions, 667; in 1911–1912, 757; during the World War, 871–872, 876–879
"Strongbow," *see* Richard de Clare
Stuart, John, Earl of Bute, 507–509 *passim*
Sturdee, Admiral, 856
Submarines, 834, 857–862, 865
Submission of the clergy, 208
Subsidies, 132, 198, 267–268
Succession, acts of, providing for the heirs of Henry VIII and Anne, 209; relating to heirs of Henry VIII and Jane Seymour, 212; *see* Northumberland's plot; plan for regulating, in 1689, 398; *see* Act of Settlement
Sudan, the, 780, 782–784
Suez Canal, the, 780–781, 815, 897
"Suffolk Resolves," the, 528 and note
Suffrage, manhood, 667, 880–881
Suffrage, women's, in Australia, 770; in New Zealand, 771; in the United Kingdom, 746, 881
Suffragists, the militant, *see* Suffrage, women's
Sumptuary laws, 132, 140
Sunday Schools, 558
Sunderland, Earl of, *see* Spencer, Robert *and* Charles
Superstition, 160, 277, 407–408
Supremacy, Act of, 245, 265–266
Supremacy, oaths of, 245, 249, 379, 425, 624–625
Supreme Court of Judication Act, the, 708
Supreme Head of the Church of England, 209–210, 245
Surgery, in the fourteenth century, 146, 739; in the nineteenth century, 739
Surrey, Earls of, *see* Howard, Henry *and* Thomas
Suspending, royal prerogative of, 398
Sussex, 860
Suttee, 785
Swansea, 5
Swein, Danish invader, 35, 36
Swift, Jonathan, 457, 472, 560
Swinburne, Algernon Charles, 733
Sydney, 769; Australian cruiser, 856
Syndicalism, 750, 757, 876
Synods, 241

T

Tacitus, 18
Taff Vale case, the, 748
Tag, Der, 815, 858; *see also* 836
Talbot, Charles, Earl, and, later, Duke of Shrewsbury, 461, 463
Talbot, Richard, Earl of Tyrconnel, 389, 392
Talbot, William, 739
Tallard, Marshal, 749
Tangier, 366 and note, 807
Tanks in the World War, 834, 849 and note
Tariff, Huskisson's reform of the, 621–622; reductions of, under Peel, 668–673; Gladstone's

reductions of, 689–690; Chamberlain advocates reform of, 753; preferential, 753, 811 note; in the Dominions, 762, 767, 796; German, fear of foreign, 809; German, 810
Tasman, Abel, 769
Tasmania, 770
Taxation, *see* Revenue *and* Poll Taxes; under the Tudors, 267–268; the arbitrary, of James I, 292; of Charles I, 305–307, 309, 312–314; curtailed, 322–323; of the American Colonies, 515–520, 521; Huskisson's reform of, 621–622
Taylor, Jeremy, 413
Tea, the tax on, 521, 527
Telegraph, the, 740
Tel-el-Kebir, battle of, 782
Telephone, the, 740 note
Telford, Thomas, 634
Temperance revival, the, 745
Temple, Richard, Lord Temple, 496 note
Temple, Lord, his son, 573
Tenant farmers, 406, 555
Tennyson, Alfred, 732–733
Tenths and fifteenths, 267
Tenures, *see* Military
Test Act, the, 374, 388, 624
Testament, *see* New Testament
Test and Corporation Acts, 468, 624, 728
Teutonic, *see* Germanic
Tewkesbury, battle of, 177
Thackeray, William Makepeace, 735
Thagi, or thugs, suppression of the, 785
Thanet, 18, 23
Theaters, 282–283; *see* Drama
Thegns, 47
Theobald, Archbishop of Canterbury, 108, 116, 126
Theology, 106–107, 151, 413, 556–558
Thirty-nine Articles, the, 249, 729
Thirty Years' War, the, 294–295, 297–299, 351
Thomas of Woodstock, Duke of Gloucester, 156, 158
Thomson, James, 564
Thomson, William, Lord Kelvin, 740
"Thorough," Wentworth and Laud's policy of, 316 and note
Thrale, Mrs., 568
Three-field system, 42
Thugs, *see* Thagi
Ticonderoga, 500
Tilak, Mr., 902
Tilbury, 260
Tilsit, treaty of, 602
Times, the London, founded, 640 note; Russell special correspondent of, during Crimean War, 685; suit of Parnell against, 718; demands "a better machine for running the War," 867
Tin in Britain, 10, 11
Tinchebrai, battle of, 64
Tipú, Ruler of Mysore, 597
Tirpitz, Admiral, 812
Tithe, Saladin, 79
Tithes, English, 658–660; Irish, 538, 624, 654–656
Toleration, religious, in *Utopia*, 201–202; absence of, in the sixteenth century, 238; or in the seventeenth, 302; failure of Charles II to secure, 362–363, 374; and of James II, 392, 394
Toleration Act, the, 424–425
Tone, Wolfe, 593, 595
Tonnage and poundage, 137, 267, 307, 322
Torbay, William's landing at, 396
Torgau, the battle of, 504
Tories, the High Church, approach the Dissenters, 392; changed attitude of, toward lawfulness of resistance, 395; *see* High Church
"Torrens System" of land registration, 770 and note
Tory party, the, origin of, 381 and note, 543–545; reaction of, against William III, 424; its relations to William III, 439; make-up and aims of, 446; the eclipse of, under the first two Georges, 471, 473; return of, to power under George III, 506; French Revolution and the, 580; reforms of the Liberal, 620 ff.; *see* Bolingbroke, Pitt the younger Peel, Disraeli, Conservatives *and* Liberal Unionists
Tostig, Earl of Northumbria, 39–40
Towns, in the seventeenth century, 409; *see* Borough
Townshend, Charles, Viscount, 463, 467–468, 470, 471 note, 476, 555
Townshend, General, 898, 899
Townshend Acts, the, 521
Townships, Anglo-Saxon, 42, 43
Towton, battle of 175
Tractarian movement, *see* Oxford movement
Tracts for the Times, the, 729
Trade, Anglo-Saxon, 50, 51; Anglo-Norman, 60; in the twelfth century, 86, 87; in the thirteenth century, 107–109; under Edward I, II, III, 138–141; in the fifteenth century, 189–191; under the Tudors, in the sixteenth century, 224, 264, 269–275; under James I and Charles I, 401–402; during the Restoration, 402; rivalry with Germany, 809–812; control of, during World War, 869–873
Trade Unionism, 667 and note, 748–749; during the World War, 871, 876–877
Trading companies, under Elizabeth, 273–274; justification for, 296, 401
Trades Disputes Act, the, 748–749
Trafalgar, battle of, 601
Transportation, *see* Canals, Steamboats, *and* Steam railways
Transportation of criminals, *see* Australia.
Transubstantiation, 227, 331; the declaration against, 621, 880; *see also* Real Presence
Transvaal, the, *see* Boer War
Travel, in Anglo-Saxon times, 50; in fourteenth century, 145; in seventeenth century, 404; *see* Stage Coaches *and* Steam railways
Treasons, Statute of, 131–132; punishment for, 143; Acts of, of Henry VIII, 209; Acts of, under Edward VI, 231, 233; under Elizabeth, 255; new theories of, 321–322, 342; *see* Casement
Treason, Act regulating trials for, 437
Treasonable Practices Bill, the, 589
Treasurer, 65
Treasury Agreement, 871, 876, 877
Treitschke, Heinrich von, 816
Trent, the Council of, 250
Trent affair, the, 691
Trial by battle, 55, 78
Trial by jury, 77–78
Tribe, the, 11, 19, 32
Triennial Acts, 322, 437
Trinoda necessitas, 46
Triple Alliance, (1716), 467; (1788), 583; of Germany, Austria, and Italy, 804, 822
Trivium, 85
Trollope, Anthony, 736
Trotsky, 849, 900 note
Tudor, Henry, Duke of Richmond, *see* Henry
Tudor, House of, basis of the new absolutism of, 183–184
Tudor monarchy, strength and weakness of, 264–265

Tull, Jethro, 554
Tun-moot, 43
Tunscipe, see township
Turco-Italian War, the, 821
Turkey, Russia at war with, 583; in the French War, 598–599; Greece revolts from, 628–630; *see* Crimean War; relations with Great Britain in the last years of Victoria, 818–820; *see also* Russo-Turkish War; Young Turkish Revolution in, 820; in Balkan Wars, 821–822; in the World War, 839; in Gallipoli, 839–842; surrenders, 853; in Egypt and Palestine, 897–898; in Mesopotamia, 899–900
Turner, Joseph Mallard, 640, 732
Turnips, the cultivation of, 403 and note, 554
Turpin, Dick, 567
Tweed River, 3
Two-bottle orthodox, the, 728–729
"Two-penny Trash," *see* Cobbett
Two Power standard, the, 812, 815
Tyler, Wat, 154–155
Tyndale, William, 216
Tyne River, 3
Tyrconnel (tercŏn'nel), the Earl of, *see* Talbot, Richard

U

Udall, Nicholas, 281
Uganda, 774
Uitlanders, the, 774, 776
Ulster, the plantation of, 291–292; the rebellion in, of 1641, 324; rebellion of 1798 in, suppressed, 592–595; Tenant Right, 705; beginning of opposition to Home Rule in, 716 and note, 722; growth of the opposition, 757–760; coalition attitude to, 881; attitude of, during the World War, 882–883, 885; toward the Convention, 888–889; as a factor in the problems, 889–890
Ulster Volunteers, 758, 885
Undertakers, 292 and note
Unemployment, insurance against, 747–748
Uniformity, first Act of, 231–232; second Act of, 234; the Act of Elizabeth, 245; the Act of 1662, 364–365
Union, the, of England and Ireland, 595–596
Union of England and Scotland, project for, 291; brought about in 1707, 451–453
Union of South Africa, 778–780
Unitarians, 425 note
United Irishmen, 593–594
United Kingdom, *see* England *and* Great Britain
United Presbyterians, 730
United States, the, independence of, acknowledged by England, 540–541; war of Great Britain with, 608–610; commercial relations of, with Great Britain improve after war of 1812, 622; thwarts European intervention in South American Republics, 627, 628 and note; boundary disputes adjusted with, 674–675; refuses to agree to "Declaration of Paris," 687 note; British relations with, during the Civil War, 690–692; England estranged by Palmerston from, 700; Fenian movement in, 702–703; Venezuela dispute with, 723, 724; British immigration to, 763; attempted reciprocity of, with Canada, 767; relations with, under Edward VII and George V, 767–768; in the World War, 833, 847, 849, 850–853, 859–861, 874; Irish party in, 884, 886
Universities, the, rise of, 84–85; in the thirteenth century, 106–107; in the fourteenth century, 147–148; in the time of Henry VIII, 207–208, 227; in the seventeenth century, 393, 405–406, 413–414, 416
"University Group," the, of Elizabethan dramatists, 281–282
Uses, Statutes of, 214 note
Usury, legislation against, 141–142, 187 and note; *see also* 270
Utilitarians, the, 414, 646
Utopia, More's
Utrecht, the Peace of, 458–460
Utrecht, the Union of, 253–254

V

Vacarius, 84 note
Valentine, Benjamin, 307–308
Valera, Eamon De, 890
Valhalla, 19
Valley Forge, 532
Vancouver, 583 note, 675, 766 note
Van Dieman's Land, 769
Vandyke, 420
Vane, Sir Harry, 320, 361 note
Vauban, 430
Vauxhall, 412
Vendome, the Duke of, 451, 453, 454
Venezuela boundary, 723–724
Venizelos, 847
Verdun, 845
Vere, Robert de, Earl of Oxford, 156
Vernon, Admiral, 480–481
Verona, European congress at, 627
Versailles, treaty of, 541
Verulam, Baron, *see* Bacon, Sir Francis
Verulamium, destruction of, 13
Veto Act, the, 730
Veto, the royal, 223, 266, 516, 761 and note
Vicegerent, the, *see* Cromwell, Thomas
Viceroy of India, 791
Victoria, Australia, 770
Victoria, Queen of Great Britain and Ireland and Empress of India, early life and accession of, 662; Civil List of, 662–663 and note; in Bedchamber crisis, 663–664; marriage of, 664–665; opposed to national liberal movement in Europe, 680; memorandum to Palmerston from, 681; tries to intervene on Austria's behalf in war of Italian Unification, 689; in Trent affair, 691; in Schleswig-Holstein question, 694; Bismarck repulses mediation offer of, 700, 709; Disraeli's policy toward, 701; attitude toward Gladstone of, *ib.*; aids passage of Gladstone's disestablishment bill, 704; abolishes purchase of army commissions, 708; her mediation in the extension of the franchise, 714; her Jubilee of 1887, 719, 763, 796; death and estimate of, 724–725; problems of her reign, 725; excludes Prince Albert from political activities, 752; made Empress of India, 792
Victoria, Empress of Germany, 694, 808 note
Victorian age, 661–662; *see also* art, historians, literature, philosophers, poets, prose, *and* science
Vienna, Congress of, 610, 612–613
Villars, Marshal, 454
Villeins, *see* Serfs *and* Villenage
Villenage, 59 and note, 87, 94, 109, 131, 142, 153, 155
Villeneuve, Admiral, Nelson defeats, off Trafalgar, 850 and note
Villeroy, Marshal, 449, 451
Villiers, George (later Duke of Buckingham), 294; journey to Spain, 298; adopts an anti-

Spanish policy, 298–299; character of, 303; impeachment of, 304; his expedition to Rhé, 304–305; his murder, 306–307
Villiers, George, second Duke of Buckingham, 372–374
Villiers, George, Earl of Clarendon, 682 note, 686
Vimy Ridge, 848
Vindictive, the, 862, 863
Virgate, 43
Virginia, 273
Visitations, *see* Metropolitical *and* Sheriffs
Vittoria, battle of, 606
Volta, Alessandro, 739
Volunteers, the Irish, 538 and note; the Ulster, 758
Vorbeck, *see* Lettow-Vorbeck
Votes for women, 746, 880–881 note
Vulgate, the, 216

W

Wade, General George, 486, 488
Wagram, battle of, 605
Wakefield, battle of, 173
Wakefield, Edward Gibbon, 763, 769, 771
Wakes, the Somerset, 310
Walcheren, battle of, 605
Wales, physical features and resources, 5; conquest of, by Edward I, 111–112; Statute of, or Rhuddlan, 112; revolt of, against Henry IV, 162; representation granted to, 223 note; disestablishment of Church in, 757
Wales, Prince of, origin of title, 112
Wales and the Marches, Council of, 268–269, 323
Wallace, Alfred Russel, 738 note
Wallace, Sir William, 116, 117
Wallingford, treaty of, 69
Walpole, Horace, later Earl of Orford, 563
Walpole (wŏl'pole), Sir Robert, later Earl of Oxford, his scheme for reducing the debt, 469; settles the affairs of the South Sea Company, 471; beginning of his ascendancy, *ib.*; his character and policy, 471–472; becomes Prime and sole Minister, 476; his excise, 476–478; his pacific policy, 478–479; his attitude toward the War of Jenkins' Ear, 479–481; forced out of office, 481; influence of, on Cabinet, 545; created Earl of Orford, *ib.*
Walsingham (wŏl'singham), Sir Francis, Secretary of State, 244
Walter, John, 640 note
Walter Map, 83–84
Walton, Izaak, 417
War of the Roses, the, opening of, 171–172; the course of, 172–177; effect on the nobility of, 183 and note
Warbeck, Perkin, 184–185
Wards and Liveries, Court of, 269
Wardship, feudal incident of, 58
Warfare, art of, in the fourteenth century, 144; innovations in, in World War, 833–834
Warwick, Earl of, *see* Neville, Dudley
Washington, destruction of, by British troops, 609
Washington, George, in the Seven Years' War, 494; Commander-in-Chief of Continental Army, 530; in campaign of 1776, 531–532; at Valley Forge, 532; hardships of army of, 536; receives surrender of Cornwallis, *ib.*
Washington, the treaty of, 710
Water frame, the, *see* Arkwright
Waterloo, campaign of, 611–612
Watling Street, 31
Watt, James, development of steam engine, 551–552
Watts, George Frederick, 744
Waverley Novels, see Scott, Sir Walter
Wavre, 611–612
Wealth, increase of, in the nineteenth century, 744
Wealth of Nations, *see* Smith, Adam
Wedderburn, Alexander, later Lord Loughborough, 527
Wedgwood, Josiah, 551
Wedmore, peace of, 31
Weekly Political Register, *see* Cobbett
Wei-hai-Wei, 807
Wellesley (wĕls'ley), Sir Arthur, Duke of Wellington, in the Peninsular Campaign, 603–606; at the Congress of Vienna, 610 and note; in Waterloo Campaign, 610–612; becomes Prime Minister, 623; Catholic Emancipation passed under Ministry of, 624–625; doom of Ministry of, 626; at Congress of Verona, 627; attitude and policy of, in Greek revolt, 629; recognizes Louis Philippe, 630; resignation of Ministry of, 647; attempts to form Ministry during Reform Bill agitation, 652; furthers Corn Law repeal, 672; measures of, against Chartist agitation, 678
Wellesley, Richard, successively Lord Mornington, Marquis Wellesley, 597, 785
Welsh Church, disestablishment of, 757 note
Wentworth, Sir Thomas (later Earl of Strafford), character of, 303; his "apostasy," 306–307; his rule in Ireland, 315–316; advises Charles to summon an English Parliament, 316; created Earl of Strafford, *ib.*; advises arbitrary methods, 316–317; impeachment and execution of, 321–322
Wergeld, 44
Wesley, Charles, 557
Wesley, John, 557–558
Wesleyan revival, 557, 558, 727
West Australia, 769–700 and note
West Florida, 541
West Indies, 509, 514, 534, 536, *see* Slavery *and* Jamaica
Westminster, Provisions of, 102, 103; Statutes of, 119, 120–121; peace of, 375 note; *see* London, treaty of
Westminster Abbey, 103, 107, 113
Westminster Assembly, the, 332–333
"Westminster Scrutiny," the, 574
Westphalia, the peace of, 351
West Saxons, the, 21, 29–30
Wexford, rebellion in, 594–595
Wheeler, General, 789
Whig party, the, origin and rise of, 376, 381; and note, 382, 343, 344; reverse of the, at the close of the exclusion struggle, 382–383; relations of, to William III, 423–424, 435, 438–440, 544–545; make-up and aims of, 446; driven out by Anne, 455–457; advantages of, in the struggle over the Hanoverian succession, 460; factions of, under George II and George III, 506; North breaks power of, 524; Pitt routs, 573–574, 579–580; French Revolution and the, 580; split in the, 1791, 581–582; views of, in 1816–1817, 615–617; rally to cause of Queen Caroline, 619; identified with movement for parliamentary reform, 646–647; carry Reform Bill of 1832, 651–653; in first reformed Parliament, 654; change of name, *ib.*; advocates *laissez-faire* in industry, 656; attitude of, toward Victoria upon her accession, 662; advocate free

trade, 671; in Coalition Ministry, 682; Disraeli opposed to commercial aristocracy of, 700; *see also* Liberal party
Whip with six strings, the, 216–217, 219, 231; *see also* Articles of Faith
Whistler, James McNeill, 744
Whitby, Synod of, triumph, 25
White, General Sir George, 77
White Book, German, 825
Whiteboys, the, 538
Whitefield, George, 557–558
Whitefriars, 411
Whitehall, 342, 411
Whiteley Report, 878–879
Whitgift, John, Archbishop of Canterbury, 256
Wiclif, John, career and activities of, 135–136; development of views, and influence of, 150–152; attitude toward Peasant Revolt, 154; Bible of, 164–216
Wigs, discarded in England, 641
Wilfrid, leader of Roman party at Whitby, 25
Wilkes, Captain, in *Trent* affair, 691
Wilkes, John, 510–512, 522
William, Fort, *see* Calcutta
William I (the Conqueror), Duke of the Normans, visits England, 38; declared heir of Edward the Confessor, 39; claims the Crown, 39–40; victory at Hastings, 40–41; captures London and crowned King, 53; disposal of lands of conquered, puts down risings and wastes vale of York, 53–54; quells a rising of the Earls, 54; method of keeping down different classes of his subjects, *ib.*; relations with the Church, 54–55, 72; his laws, 55–56; orders Domesday Survey, 56; last years and death, 56–57; introduces feudal tenures into England, 57–58; brings jury system to England, 77; charter to London, 85
William II (Rufus), character and policy, 61–62; his rule, 62–63
William of Orange, Stadholder of the Dutch, later William III of England, marries Mary, 376; the English begin to look to, 388; sends Dykevelt to England, 392–393; invited to England, 395; issues a Declaration and sails for England, 395–396; lands at Torbay, 396; arrives in London, 397; calls a convention which chooses him and Mary as joint sovereigns, 398–399; significance of his reign, 423; reaction against, 423–424; works for toleration, 424–425; dissatisfied with the revenue settlement, 425–426; victor at the Boyne, 427–428; opposition of the Scots to, 429; sanctions the massacre of Glencoe, 430; forms an alliance against France, 430; his succession of defeats, 431–432; plot to assassinate, 434; arranges the peace of Ryswick, 435; forms a Whig Cabinet, 438–439, 544–545; quarrels with Parliament, 439–440; arranges the Partition Treaties, 442; forms the Grand Alliance, 443; death and character of, 443–444
William IV, King of Great Britain and Ireland, personal traits of, 645; attitude toward parliamentary reform, 647–652; accepts resignation of Melbourne, 658; death of, 660
William I, German Emperor, 709
William II, German Emperor, his accession and early policies, 804–805; asserts himself in Morocco, 807–808, 820–821; attitude of, to England, 808; attitude of, to Hague Conference, 813; toward naval program, 812, 814, 815; his utterances, 813, 816, 817; Eastern policy of, 818–819; "in shining armor," 820, 826; in the negotiations leading to the World War, 824; his abdication, 852; to be called to account, 881
William (the Silent), of Orange, 250–251, 254–255 and note, 257
William Augustus, Duke of Cumberland, 486–487, 499
William FitzOsbert (Longbeard), 82
William, Lord Latimer, 134–135
William Longchamp, 80–81
William Marshall, Earl of Pembroke, Regent of England, 98
William of Malmesbury, 61
William of Newburgh, 83
Willoughby, Sir Hugh, 271
Wills, *see* Probate
Wilmot, John, Earl of Rochester, 360
Wilson, President, 768, 860
Winchester, court school at, 32
Winchester, Statute of, 119–120
Winchester Fair, 108
Wireless telegraphy, 740 note
Wishart (wish'art), George, 242
Witchcraft, 106, 277, 407–408
Wite, 44
Witenagemot, 46
Woden, 19
Wolfe, General James, 499–501
Wolseley, Marshal Garnet, Lord Wolseley, 77 note, 783
Wolsey, Thomas, Cardinal, and Archbishop of York, rise of, 195–196; concludes the Treaty of Universal Peace, 196; vain attempts to secure the Papacy, 197–198; his policy of alliance with the Emperor, 197; unpopularity of his subsidy and of his amicable loan, 197–198; attitude toward the New Learning, 202; his share in the divorce of Henry VIII and Catharine, 203–204; fall and death of, 204–205; dissolves some smaller monasteries, 211
Women, legislation regulating of employment of, 670; condition of, in the nineteenth century, 746, *see* Votes for
Wool, act for burying in, 401; trade, 138–140, 191, 271, 273
Woolsack, the, 273 note
Worcester (woos'ter), battle of 347
Wordsworth, William, 636–637, 730
Workingman's Association, the, 667
Workmen's Compensation Acts, 747
Wren, Christopher, 420–421
Writs, legal, 78
Wyatt, Sir Thomas, the poet, 228
Wyatt's Rebellion, 237

Y

Yeomen, in the fifteenth century, 188; in the seventeenth century, 406; in the eighteenth century, 555
York, vale of, wasted by William I, 53, 54
York, Dukes of, *see* Edward, Frederick Augustus, George James, Richard
York, House of, causes of triumph of, 175; causes of fall of, 181
Yorktown, surrender of Lord Cornwallis at, 536
Young, Arthur, 554, 635
Young, Edward, 564
Young England Party, the, 669, 700
Young Ireland Party, the, 677
Young Turks, 820
Ypres, 838, 844

Z

Zamindars, 787
Zanzibar, 774
Zeebrugge, 838, 862–863
Zukunft, *see* Harden
Zulu War, the, 773
Zwingli, Ulrich, 202, 231

Printed in the United States of America.

Legislative power of [illegible] — Statute
King versus Parliament

1. Parliament ... money ... only for ...
2. King conceded Parliament right to audit ...
3. Money grants to originate in Lower House
4. Parl. + Bishops ... Church ... now ...

Magna Carta 1215
[illegible] 1625
[illegible] 1688

1. [illegible] with fixing [illegible]
2. [illegible] Act

Battle of Sedgemoor 1685 -
Last battle on Eng. soil.

James II rushed to repeal Habeas Corpus
Repeal Test. Act.
Quartered soldiers in homes.
3 Reasons to break with Parliament
maintain standing army
T & C. Act + Test Act.

Dec. 11

Def. of Bill of attainder
Def. Habeas Corpus Act.

eighs